

**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**GIFT OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 3

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

JUNE 6, 1956

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(INDEX IN PART 4 OF THIS SERIES)



HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

OCT 5 1956

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1956

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

RICHARD ARENS, *Director*

CONTENTS

Executive Hearings (See Pt. 3)¹

June 2, 1956:	Testimony of—	Page
	Joseph John Schoemehl.....	4949
	Loyal Hammack.....	4966
	George V. L. Hardy.....	4971
June 4, 1956:	Testimony of—	
	Joseph John Schoemehl (resumed).....	4979
	Obadiah Jones.....	4981

Public Hearings

PART 1

June 4, 1956:	Testimony of—	Page
	William W. Cortor.....	4724
	Afternoon session:	
	William W. Cortor (resumed).....	4758
	James H. Sage.....	4761
	Elliott Waxman.....	4794
	Leslie S. Davison.....	4793
	Sol S. Nissen.....	4794
	John William Simpson.....	4798

PART 2

June 5, 1956:	Testimony of—	
	John William Simpson (resumed).....	4803
	William Henry Holland.....	4808
	Harvey John Dav.....	4818
	Thebna Hecht (Mrs. Julius Hecht).....	4825
	Brockman Schumacher.....	4829
	Thomas A. Younglove.....	4834
	Afternoon session:	
	Thomas A. Younglove (resumed).....	4845
	Orville Leach.....	4864
	Zollie C. Carpenter.....	4869
	James Payne.....	4876
	Helen Ankamp Sage (Mrs. James H. Sage).....	4883

PART 3

June 6, 1956:	Testimony of—	
	Dr. Sol Londe.....	4889
	William Edwin Davis.....	4895
	Ida Holland (Mrs. William Henry Holland).....	4899
	Edwin Leslie Richardson.....	4902
	Anne (Ann) Yasgur Kling.....	4912
	Afternoon session:	
	Anne (Ann) Yasgur Kling (Resumed).....	4920
	Gilbert Harold Hall.....	4940
	Richard L. Stanford.....	4944
	Romey Hudson.....	4945

¹ Released by the committee August 24, 1956 and ordered to be printed.

PART 4

June 8, 1956: Testimony of—	Page
Helen Musiel.....	4993
Hershel James Walker.....	5000
George Kimmel.....	5004
Hershel James Walker (recalled).....	5014
Linus E. Wampler.....	5017
George Kimmel (recalled).....	5026
Afternoon session:	
Dr. John F. Rutledge.....	5028
Ella Mae Posey Pappademos.....	5051
Clara Perkins (Mrs. Haven Perkins).....	5058
Haven Perkins.....	5065
Julius Hecht.....	5069
Sol Derman.....	5070
Douglas MacLeod.....	5072
Index.....	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.
(A) Un-American Activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 3

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
St. Louis, Mo.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 9:45 a. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom No. 3, United States Courthouse and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri, James B. Frazier, Jr., of Tennessee, and Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel, George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Will you call your next witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Sol Londe, will you come forward, please, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. LONDE. I do.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee wishes to announce that we are highly honored and pleased to have with us in the hearing room Mr. Richards, the United States District Attorney.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

TESTIMONY OF DR. SOL LONDE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, MARK M. HENNELLY

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Dr. LONDE. Sol Londe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Sol Londe?

Dr. LONDE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. HENNELLY. Mark M. Hennelly, H-e-n-n-e-l-l-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Attorney of the St. Louis bar?

Mr. HENNELLY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Dr. Londe?

Dr. LONDE. I was born in St. Louis, Mo., on January 12, 1904.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a medical practitioner?

Dr. LONDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a specialist in any field, or a general practitioner?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. I am a pediatrician.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you engaged in the practice of medicine in St. Louis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been so engaged in the city of St. Louis?

Dr. LONDE. Since 1932, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, briefly, what your formal educational training has been.

Dr. LONDE. All of my education has been in St. Louis public schools, Central High School; a B. S. degree at Washington University; and M. D., Washington University Medical School.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your training at Washington University?

Dr. LONDE. From 1921 to 1923 in college, and from 1923 to 1927 in medical school.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sorry I did not get the last.

Dr. LONDE. 1921 to 1923 at the college, and 1923 to 1927 at the medical school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Londe, the committee heard, in executive session, the testimony of Mr. Joseph John Schoemehl. Mr. Schoemehl was asked the question "Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Dr. Sol Londe?"

I want to read to you the answer that he gave, and 1 or 2 questions asked the witness inasmuch as this relates to you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schoemehl, are you acquainted with a person by the name of Dr. Sol Londe?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known by you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. When I was the unit organizer of a unit on the South Side, Dr. Londe and the woman whom he married later were assigned to my unit to attend a couple of meetings in order to learn how to conduct a meeting of the Communist Party. This was done at the orders of the district organizer at that time. He informed me that Dr. Londe and his fiancée were going to set up a professional unit of the Communist Party, membership to be limited entirely to professional people, and that Dr. Londe was to be the unit organizer of that unit. They attended 2 meetings, to my knowledge—it may have been 3—at which they sat in at the meetings and asked me about different matters as to how things were being conducted.

* * * * *

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Dr. Londe, while attending your meetings, indicate to you in any manner that he had been assigned for that particular type of work?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. When he came to the meeting that night he introduced himself and had credentials there from the district organizer instructing me to permit him to attend the meetings. No outsider was permitted to attend a unit meeting unless he was known as an official of the party. And that was done in order that I would permit him to sit in at the meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the year in which that occurred?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That occurred sometime prior to 1938.

I do not propose to ask you any questions relating to the person referred to as your wife. I only want to ask you regarding your own activities.

Will you tell the committee, please, whether this testimony given and as read to you, insofar as it affected you or referred to you, is in any way untrue?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. I decline to answer that under the privilege granted me by the fifth amendment, which states that no person shall be forced to bear witness against himself.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I should state, Mr. Chairman, for the record that Mr. Schoemehl in the course of his testimony advised the committee that he had become a member of the Communist Party at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and that during the period of his connection with the Communist Party he was doing so in the performance of official duties.

I think the record should also show that the reason for taking Mr. Schoemehl's testimony in executive session was that he is presently in ill health under doctor's care, and questioning could not be continued for much more than 15 or 20 minutes at a time.

The purpose in calling you as a witness, Dr. Londe, is to obtain from you, if you will give it, such information as you have regarding the organization of a professional group of the Communist Party in St. Louis, the manner in which it functioned and the extent of its membership, and what its objectives are.

Did you organize a professional group of the Communist Party in the area of St. Louis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. Sir, I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the privilege granted me by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of an organized group of the Communist Party composed of professional people in the area of St. Louis?

Dr. LONDE. I decline to answer that question, invoking the same privilege previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the extent of the membership of the professional group of the Communist Party in St. Louis, if you know.

Dr. LONDE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Londe, the committee, during the course of this hearing, has heard considerable evidence regarding activities in which members of the Communist Party were asked to engage—that is, activities in mass organizations. One of the mass organizations was the Civil Rights Congress.

Were you identified in any manner with the Civil Rights Congress?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. I decline to answer that under the privilege granted me by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee's investigation has disclosed that on May 6, 1950, you were chairman of the St. Louis chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. I want to ask you questions relating to the activities of that group and the extent, if any, to which it was organized and controlled by the Communist Party.

Were you chairman of the St. Louis chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

Dr. LONDE. I decline to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment previously invoked, and also under the first and ninth amendments, as this question invades certain rights granted by those amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the 6th day of May 1950, were you aware that the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, that is the national organization, had been cited as a Communist front by this committee?

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. Sir, I decline to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think the record should show that that action was taken by this committee on April 19, 1949.

I have before me a photostatic copy of the October 20, 1954, issue of the Daily Worker which carries a headline to this effect: "175 Notables in Open Letter to President Urge Amnesty for Smith Act Victims."

Examination of the article discloses the names of many of those who signed that open letter, and, among them, is the name of Sol Londe, M. D., St. Louis.

Do you recall having signed such a letter?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And, if you desire to look at the article to refresh your recollection, I now hand it to you.

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. It is on the second page. Your name is underscored in red.

Dr. LONDE. Sir, I decline to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment previously invoked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't misunderstand me. Anyone has a right to address a letter to the President of the United States on any subject that he may desire.

My reason for asking you that question is to find out whether or not the Communist Party instigated this matter.

The committee wants to know to what extent the various propaganda moves made during this period of time were the responsibility of the Communist Party.

Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you were requested by anyone known to you to be a member of the Communist Party to take part in a plan to secure amnesty for the Communists, the leading Communists in the country, who were convicted under the Smith Act in New York?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of those who participated in a plan to secure amnesty for those convicted under the Smith Act?

Dr. LONDE. I decline, reinvoking my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Investigation made by the staff has resulted in the production of a photostatic copy of an article in the April 12, 1948,

issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which carries an article relating to the establishment of the Wallace Third Party as organized in Missouri. This article shows the names of members of the State committee from some of the congressional districts. For instance, in the 12th District it is said the State committee members were Dr. Sol Londe, Al Friedman, Mrs. Olive Heffner, and one other person.

Did you serve on that committee with Al Friedman and Mrs. Olive Heffner as representatives from the 12th District?

Dr. LONDE. What was that question, sir? I didn't hear a question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I said, Did you serve on the State committee with Al Friedman and Mrs. Olive Heffner as representatives of the 12th District?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. Sir, I refuse to answer that question, first of all, under the first amendment as invading certain rights which are guaranteed by that amendment, and under the fifth amendment granting a person the right not to bear witness against himself, and under the ninth amendment as also invading fundamental rights of the individual.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Al Friedman?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. I invoke the same amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Mrs. Olive Heffner?

Dr. LONDE. I invoke the same amendments previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both of those individuals have been identified during the course of testimony under oath given here as members of the Communist Party.

Were either of them known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Dr. LONDE. I invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment, and decline to answer that question also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, to what extent the Communist Party in St. Louis was instrumental in the formation of a so-called political party in 1948.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. I decline to answer that question under the privileges of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you directed or encouraged by the Communist Party in the city of St. Louis to take an active part in the Progressive Party in 1948?

Dr. LONDE. I invoke the same privilege, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not believe I asked you whether you are now a resident of St. Louis.

Dr. LONDE. I am a resident of University City, which is a suburb of St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address?

Dr. LONDE. 7320 Colgate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you maintain an office in St. Louis proper?

Dr. LONDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRAZIER (presiding). Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Dr. Londe, the committee has found from the testimony taken in various parts of the country that the Communist cells among professional people were highly effective and that in practically all cases the membership of those cells was kept extremely secret. No party cards were issued to the members of professional cells.

As I said, the work of those cells, because of the character of the membership, was highly effective.

We feel that you have some valuable information concerning the professional cell of the Communist Party in the area of St. Louis. The committee would like to have that information, the Government would like to have that information.

You have refused to answer the significant questions asked you by Mr. Tavenner on the grounds that your answers might tend to incriminate you.

The committee has the right, as I told two other witnesses yesterday and the day before, to grant you immunity from prosecution so that, no matter what answer you gave in response to the questions asked you, it could not result in any possible criminal prosecution.

If the committee should decide to grant you that immunity because of the importance of the information which we know you have, would you then testify?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Dr. LONDE. Sir, this is a question which would require a great deal of thought and consideration.

It is a hypothetical question which deals with the future, and at the present time I could not give an answer to that.

Mr. SCHERER. It is not a hypothetical question. It may require a great deal of thought. But assuming that after you and your able counsel—one of the most able members of the bar here in St. Louis, so I am informed—after lengthy consideration you should come to the conclusion that you could not be prosecuted as a result of any answers you might give to these questions—and the Supreme Court has within the last 30 days held that that law is constitutional—if, after that consultation and consideration, you should be advised or you should come to the conclusion definitely that no prosecution could result because of the immunity granted you by the committee, would you then answer the questions asked?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Dr. LONDE. It is still a question that I cannot answer at the present moment.

Mr. SCHERER. Doctor, when you answer that way then there is some question, at least in my mind, whether you invoke the fifth amendment in good faith.

Don't misunderstand me.

I think you have the right to invoke the fifth amendment. But I don't think you fear criminal prosecution.

That is all.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William E. Davis.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DAVIS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM E. DAVIS

Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. William E. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel.

I want to advise you, as it is the practice of the committee with respect to all witnesses who appear before it, that they have the right to counsel if they desire it, and have the right to consult with counsel at any time during the course of the interrogation.

When and where were you born, Mr. Williams?

Mr. DAVIS I meant to say.

Mr. DAVIS. I decline to answer the question on the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I can't hear.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I have a direction?

Mr. SCHERER. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was when and where were you born.

Mr. SCHERER. Did he give his name?

Did you ask him his name?

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked him if he was William E. Davis, and he said yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Then I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to when and where he was born.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say to the witness, as we are required to say by the decisions of the court, that of course we do not accept your answer, that we cannot possibly see, sir, how to answer the question as to when and where you were born would inculpate you.

Therefore, we think you are invoking the fifth amendment, improperly invoking it, in bad faith, and if you persist to refuse to answer the question as to when and where you were born you are placing yourself in a position of contempt before this committee.

Do you want to answer the question after my explanation?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. What do you mean by reasserting the privilege?

Mr. DAVIS. Privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you honestly perceive that to answer the question—Do you honestly believe and contend that to answer the question as to when and where you were born might tend to lead to a criminal prosecution?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you want a lawyer? Because I am afraid, sir, you are guilty of contempt. Do you want a lawyer to advise you as to whether or not you should answer that question?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you mean to answer my question as to whether you want a lawyer would tend to inculpate you?

I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

And Mr. Scherer and the committee are anxious to, of course, help you in that respect.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. It is obvious that this witness came here as the result of attending one of those conferences wherein they advised them to use the fifth amendment no matter what question was asked them.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that counsel be permitted to ask a few more questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I expect I ought to follow them up.

Mr. SCHERER. That is what I say.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. William E. Davis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder, please.

Mr. DAVIS. William E. Davis. William Edwin Davis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you presently reside in St. Louis?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you employed?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address in St. Louis?

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to where he was employed.

And I do not want to restate, but, Witness, what I have said to you with reference to the first question asked you, as to where and when you were born, applies also to the question asked you about your employment.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question, Mr. Davis.

As we have advised other witnesses, the purpose of so directing you is not to threaten you in any way but to give you an opportunity to be advised that the committee doesn't accept your response to the question; and also to warn you of the possibility of your being in contempt of the Congress of the United States for refusing to answer such a question, such a simple question as you are now refusing to answer.

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is again directed to answer the question.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in St. Louis, living in St. Louis as recently as 1954?

Mr. DAVIS. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you living in St. Louis in 1950?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living in 1951?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to where he was living in 1951.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Where did you go to school, Witness?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask a question.

Do you desire to have counsel or an attorney to advise you and to sit with you here in the hearing room, to advise you during the course of the examination now being conducted?

I say do you desire to have counsel?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you answer the question for the record so that it will indicate.

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you had legal advice before you took the stand?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. As to whether he had legal advice.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you had any advice at all from any source as to how you should conduct yourself when you took the stand?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Where you born in the United States?

(There was no response.)

Mr. MOULDER. The question is were you born in the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you an American citizen, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you a natural-born citizen or naturalized citizen?

Mr. DAVIS. Natural born.

Mr. MOULDER. Then you were born in the United States?

Mr. SCHERER. Is that right?

(There was no response.)

Mr. MOULDER. Is that correct? Answer that question.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were you born?

Mr. DAVIS. A question like this is, as the Congressman on the right is always waiting for the door to fly open, you know——

Mr. MOULDER. I have asked you a question: where you were born.

Mr. DAVIS. So he can lower the boom on me.

Mr. MOULDER. We have no desire to trap you or lower the boom. We asked you a simple and reasonable and fair question.

Would you answer the question as to where you were born?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed at any time at Emerson Electric Co.?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the St. Louis agent of the National Maritime Union at any time prior to 1951?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time held any official position in the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you held a position under that of an official, that is such as a steward or other similar type of position?

Mr. DAVIS. In what?

Mr. TAVENNER. In the UE.

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I again ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. You are again directed and requested to answer the question.

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities since 1954 at Emerson Electric?

Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. I neglected to ask you, Mr. Frazier, do you have any questions?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused, and he may claim his witness fees from the Clerk of the Committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the subcommittee recommend to the full committee that William E. Davis be cited for contempt of Congress.

Mr. FRAZIER. Second.

Mr. MOULDER. The motion has been made by Mr. Scherer, of Ohio, and seconded by Mr. Frazier, of Tennessee, that the witness William E. Davis be cited for contempt of the United States Congress.

Vote will be recorded by the subcommittee as follows—the roll is called as follows:

Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Aye.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. Aye.

Mr. MOULDER. And myself, Morgan Moulder, votes aye.

The motion is carried and the recommendation will be duly made to the full committee to cite William E. Davis for contempt.

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Ida Holland.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please, Mrs. Holland.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to

give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I do.

Mr. MOULDER. Be seated, please.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. IDA HOLLAND

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. HOLLAND. My name is Mrs. Ida Holland.

Mr. TAVENNER. H-o-l-l-a-n-d?

Mrs. HOLLAND. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. You are advised that you have the right to consult counsel at any time during your appearance as a witness, or to have counsel with you:

Are you Mrs. W. Henry Holland?

Mrs. HOLLAND. Yes, I am.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Holland, the committee received evidence the day before yesterday from Mr. Cortor that he attended Communist Party meetings in your home, that your husband W. Henry Holland was the leader or head of his Communist Party group in an automotive branch of the Communist Party; that you attended several of those meetings, and that you said that you were a member of another group.

I desire to ask you, of what group of the Communist Party were you a member?

Mrs. HOLLAND. What part of that was your question, sir? Would you repeat, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what group of the Communist Party were you a member?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I assert my privilege under the rights granted me by the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States in not answering that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Cortor tell this committee the truth when he said that you were a member of another group of the Communist Party and not the one of which he was a member?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your educational training has been.

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to her educational training.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes; the witness is directed and requested to answer the question as to her educational training, as stated by Mr. Scherer.

The committee doesn't accept your answer, and certainly to answer that question would not tend to incriminate you in any way.

Mrs. HOLLAND. Sir, I sincerely believe that any testimony given to this committee might tend to incriminate me. Therefore, I must reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it for that reason that you invoke the privilege, because you believe that any testimony given this committee might tend to incriminate you?

Mrs. HOLLAND. No, sir. I was directing my answer to Chairman Moulder in answering his one particular question.

Mr. SCHERER. You said that you feel that any testimony given to this committee might tend to incriminate you.

Mrs. HOLLAND. I was answering, sir, one specific question asked of me.

Mr. SCHERER. What specific question were you answering?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I was asked—

May I please have that question repeated, sir?

Mr. SCHERER. To save the time, what is your educational background?

Mrs. HOLLAND. Chairman, who am I addressing at this point? I am confused.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, I believe our conversation was along this line: I said I couldn't understand how your answering a question in giving information as to your educational training could possibly tend to incriminate you. I believe you stated that you believed that the answer to any question—

Mrs. HOLLAND. May I clarify my answer to you, Chairman?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, you may.

Mrs. HOLLAND. May I restate my answer this way in clarification of my original answer:

Any testimony given to this committee concerning any part of my formal education might be used in criminal prosecution at some time against me.

Mr. MOULDER. I can assure you that it most certainly would not be. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you honestly believe that to answer the question as to how long you have lived in the city of St. Louis might result in a criminal prosecution?

Mrs. HOLLAND. Yes, sir; I sincerely do.

Mr. SCHERER. Where were you born?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to where she was born.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mrs. HOLLAND. Sir, my answer is the same to this question as to the other question which I answered to you a minute ago.

Mr. MOULDER. In so directing you to answer we want you to clearly understand the committee is not in any way threatening you to compel you to answer.

It is our duty to advise you, however, that we do not accept your responses to the questions propounded to you, and to further advise you that there is a possibility that your refusal to answer the questions might make you guilty of contempt.

Mrs. HOLLAND. Then I will answer the question this way:

I sincerely believe that answering Mr. Scherer's question as so stated might tend to criminally—be used in criminal prosecution against me.

Mr. MOULDER. You are claiming the privilege under the fifth amendment. Is that your purpose?

Mrs. HOLLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you born in the United States?

Mrs. HOLLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Where in the United States?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, there was no direction to answer the question as to how long she has lived in St. Louis, and I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed, Mrs. Holland.

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Where do you live now?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to where she lives because I can't possibly see how where she lives now could possibly tend to incriminate her.

Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed, Mrs. Holland.

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask a few more questions.

Are you married?

Mrs. HOLLAND. Yes, I am.

Mr. MOULDER. And when were you married?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. You then take the position before this committee that to state and tell the date of your marriage might tend to incriminate you and subject you to possible criminal prosecution?

Mrs. HOLLAND. Yes, I sincerely do.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to have counsel to advise you on those questions?

Mrs. HOLLAND. No, sir. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. And do you wish to ask this witness any more questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. One question.

Are you a college graduate?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that the witness be directed to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Have you consulted an attorney, and have you had any legal advice as to your conduct in appearing before this committee as a witness?

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct her to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mrs. HOLLAND. I reassert my privilege, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. It is very unfortunate, Mrs. Holland, that you take the position that you have taken in your appearance before this committee, in your very determined refusal to answer any questions.

And so I believe that you, of course, should be subjected to the same treatment as any other witness that appears before the committee even though you are a woman.

I so recommend to the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Second, that she be cited for contempt.

I recommend to the full committee she be cited for contempt.

Mr. MOULDER. You are excused as a witness.

We will have the record show that the motion has been made and seconded, that the witness Ida Holland be cited for contempt, and that this subcommittee recommend to the full committee that such action be taken, that she be cited for contempt of the United States Congress. The vote on this motion is now taken.

Mr. Scherer of Ohio?

Mr. SCHERER. Aye.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. Aye.

Mr. MOULDER. And I, chairman of the subcommittee, vote aye in favor of the motion.

Call your next witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder and Frazier.)

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Edwin L. Richardson.

Mr. MOULDER. Please be sworn, Mr. Richardson.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF EDWIN LESLIE RICHARDSON, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, FRANK WOLFF

Mr. WOLFF. Let the record show that the witness is represented by Frank Wolff, W-o-l-f-f, attorney at law, with offices in the Buder Building, admitted to practice by the Missouri Supreme Court in 1924, and also admitted to practice in the Federal court since February 1926.

Mr. MOULDER. All right, Mr. Wolff.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, sir?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Edwin Leslie Richardson.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Richardson?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was born in St. Louis February 4, 1925.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I reside at 4103 Garfield in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of St. Louis?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have been in or around St. Louis all my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am a graduate of Culver-Stockton College in Canton, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of your graduation?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. You can remember the year; can't you, Mr. Richardson? Not the exact date of the month, but I mean the year of your graduation.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I remember it was 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. What degree did you receive?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Bachelor of arts degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had any other college work other than at Culver-Stockton College?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Part of the college credits that I got I didn't earn at that college. I got them from my naval-aviation experience.

Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. RICHARDSON. For 3 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the period of your service in the Army?

Mr. RICHARDSON. 1943 through 1946 as I remember it. It was two hitches in the Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you enter Culver-Stockton College after your discharge from the Navy?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I entered prior to my enlistment in the Navy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also enter it after your return from your naval service?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I returned to school under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. TAVENNER. So you returned to school in 1946. You probably did not get your degree that year. You were probably there several years, weren't you?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Wait just a minute.

I can't remember too much the years that that took place.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what subject did you major?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I majored in religion and minored in sociology.

And while I was at the school the last 2 years I was a student minister, and I had 1 church in Ursa, Ill., and 1 in Knox City, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you an ordained minister?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation now?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I work in a factory.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what factory?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Graham Paper Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. In St. Louis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin your employment at Graham Paper Co.?

Mr. RICHARDSON. About 3 years ago, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you an application for employment with Graham Paper Co., bearing date of October 12, 1953. Will you

examine it, please, and state whether that is your application for employment.

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was, is this application for employment your application?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I decline to answer on the grounds that the answer might incriminate me, under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the signature Edwin L. Richardson appearing at the bottom of the document your signature?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence, marked "Richardson Exhibit No. 1," for identification purposes in the records of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked "Richardson Exhibit No. 1," and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Richardson, do you recall the occasion of June 18, 1951, at your home when James Sage was arrested?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to reassert my privilege. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was found in the automobile of Mr. James Sage, parked in front of your house on June 18, 1951, a notebook containing names of numerous persons who have been shown during the course of this hearing to have been members of the Communist Party.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. That notebook contained a breakdown of various groups in this area by number and by name. It also included memorandums indicating that the individuals on that list were expecting to take carloads of people to Chicago to attend a convention held there. We have also shown that the convention to be held in Chicago was under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade.

Was the matter of attendance at that convention discussed at your home on the 18th of June 1951, by James Sage and others?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to reassert my right under the fifth amendment not to answer that question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a propaganda moving picture film displayed at your home on the 18th of June 1951?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a police raid at your home on the 18th day of June 1951?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. The application for employment at the Graham Paper Co. bears date of October 12, 1953. Were you a member of the Communist Party on that day?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. The staff, in the course of its investigation, has received from Culver-Stockton College your record while at school. It shows you were awarded a bachelor of arts degree on January 24, 1948. Does that refresh your recollection as to the time that you graduated?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. And, if you desire, I will hand it to you so that you may refresh your recollection. It is quite a commendable record and shows an outstanding scholastic achievement on your part.

You will find the date of the awarding of the degree and your graduation on the reverse side of the sheet.

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was:

Does that refresh your recollection as to the time that you received your degree?

That is the only question I am going to ask you about that record. It is merely a matter to refresh your recollection.

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. It doesn't refresh my memory because I don't remember. I said before to the best I could remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. You still do not remember after seeing the record of your graduation?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I will introduce the document in order to show that your date of graduation was January 1948, and ask that the document be marked "Richardson Exhibit No. 2" for identification purposes in the files of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked as requested by counsel.

(The document referred to was marked "Richardson Exhibit No. 2," and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. SCHERER. Are you finished with that particular document?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. May I look at it, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Richardson, it is noted that your application for employment, under date of October 12, 1953, shows that you answered the inquiry as to your education as follows: "High school."

Why didn't you advise your employer in your application that you were a college graduate and that you had had an outstanding record of scholastic achievement?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Where did you go to high school?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I went to high school at Webster Groves High School.

Mr. SCHERER. Where is Webster Groves?

Mr. WOLFF. Your Honor, that is a suburb of St. Louis.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that near Kirkwood, Mo.?

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, sir; that is near Kirkwood.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Richardson, are you familiar with the testimony of Herbert A. Philbrick before the Committee on Un-American Activities?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I fail to see how it could possibly incriminate you to state whether or not you are familiar with the testimony of a witness before this committee. Certainly you are not making that claim in good faith when you refuse to answer that question. I believe you must have misunderstood the question.

My question was whether or not you are familiar with the testimony Mr. Philbrick gave before this committee in Washington.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Herbert Philbrick.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick, yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Herbert A. Philbrick testified that he remembered specifically the Communist Party building conference where the comrades were instructed to take positions as colonizers. That is, to take upon themselves the duty of being colonizers in key industries.

This committee developed a great deal of testimony in the State of Michigan regarding the use of colonizers, the taking of students out of certain colleges in the city of New York, even those who had received electrical engineering degrees, and placing them in industry in a capacity that any high school student could have held down, or even a person without any education at all.

And, in order to get those people into industry, those people concealed the fact that they had had college training. In some instances those individuals furnished false information regarding previous employment.

An abundance of evidence was obtained to show that those individuals engaging in that plan of colonization did so by acquiring leadership in the field of labor in those industries in order that the Communist Party could infiltrate labor organizations and become leaders.

Now, although you had an A. B. degree from college, it is noticed that you concealed that information when you applied for this position. Did you do so to carry out any plan of the Communist Party to colonize industry in St. Louis?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. The same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. You refuse to answer?

Mr. RICHARDSON. On the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you took your employment, which must have occurred sometime after October 12, 1953, did you obtain any position in your local labor union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. The same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. You decline to answer, claiming your privilege under the fifth amendment of the Constitution. Is that correct?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. Then hereafter you may so respond to the question by saying "Same answer", and then it will be understood that you are claiming the privilege.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Moulder, I believe it was announced by either Mr. Tavenner or yourself that, for the purpose of saving time, if he wanted to avail himself of the fifth amendment, that he should say "The same answer." He was here yesterday at the hearings.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I don't think you should say "The same answer" because it isn't an answer. It is a refusal to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. You may state that you decline to answer—

Mr. SCHERER. You decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. After October 12, 1953, were you a member of an organized group of the Communist Party consisting of members of one or more local labor unions?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of a labor union after October 12, 1953?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Haven't you been a shop steward in Local 688 of the teamsters union?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you unsuccessfully run for the position of chief steward in 1955?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, you didn't even disclose to your union that you had these educational qualifications, did you?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Repeat the question, please.

Mr. SCHERER. I say you didn't even disclose to your union that you had these educational qualifications, did you?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. What union has bargaining rights at the Graham Paper Co?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't that a very unfair position to take toward that union, to state that the mere fact that it has bargaining rights might tend to incriminate you if you would answer it?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no way of knowing, Mr. Tavenner, but I doubt whether even the union knows the subterfuge practiced by this individual. It is again an attempt by the Communists to infiltrate certain unions without disclosing the background of the members who are attempting to infiltrate.

As you point out, it is most unfair to this union.

Mr. TAVENNER. It may be, however, that since his effort to run for an office proved unsuccessful, they did catch on.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the reason I say that.

Mr. MOULDER. If you were a member of the Communist Party and a member of a labor union, would you advise and inform your fellow members of that union that you were a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of an organization known as the Young Progressives of America?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. At one period of time the youth organization of the Communist Party was disbanded and its membership was directed to get into the Labor Youth League and the Young Progressives of America. Did you observe that that was the procedure here in St. Louis.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. MOULDER. When you were a candidate for chief steward, did the members of your union know you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. MOULDER. Any more questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. Since your graduation have you continued to preach?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer Congressman Frazier's question. He indicated voluntarily in the beginning of his testimony that he did preach at two churches while he was still a student.

Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed.

And, in addition to that, may I say I couldn't possibly understand how anyone could be guilty or could possibly incriminate himself by stating whether or not they were preaching in a church.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. He voluntarily made the statement in response to one of the questions, that while he was in his senior year he preached at two churches.

Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed.

Mr. SCHERER. He is shown here on his record to be correct in that statement.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. FRAZIER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer, do you have any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. Do you have any other occupation other than that with the Graham Paper Co.?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have worked at the Graham Paper Co. for about the last 3 years.

Mr. SCHERER. Now during those 3 years, did you have any other occupation?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You said in response to a question by Mr. Tavenner—and it was purely voluntary on your part—that you preached at two churches while you were at Culver-Stockton College. Now what were those two churches?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I previously identified the churches at which I preached.

Mr. SCHERER. I am sorry, but if you did I do not recall. Will you identify them again.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thought I did.

One at Ursa, Ill., and one in Knox City, Mo.

Mr. SCHERER. And are those the only churches at which you have preached?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Certainly he hasn't the right to invoke the fifth amendment now when I ask him if those were the only two churches at which he preached, because he has opened the door if he did have any right to invoke the fifth amendment, which I do not think he had.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer. And you are advised, as we have advised other witnesses, that this direction is not given in the spirit of a threat but for the purpose of advising you that the committee doesn't accept your answer or your response as having been made in good faith in claiming the protection of the fifth amendment, and also to warn you of the possible dangers of your being confronted with and being guilty of contempt.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. To the best of my knowledge, those are the only places.

No, I did not.

Mr. SCHERER. You graduated in 1948 from Culver-Stockton College and made your application for employment with the Graham Paper Co. on October 12, 1953. It was that application which Mr. Tavenner referred in which you stated that the only education you had was high school.

Where did you work between the time that you graduated from Culver-Stockton College and the time you started to work for Graham Paper Co. in 1953?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. In your application to the Graham Paper Co. you say you were self-employed during that period. Were you self-employed?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. You are not going to tell us what you did from the time you graduated from Culver-Stockton College until you started to work for the Graham Paper Co. in October of 1953?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you employed during that time by the Communist Party?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever receive any compensation from the Communist Party?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you do any preaching from the time you graduated from Culver-Stockton until you started to work for the Graham Paper Co?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever work in packinghouses as a punch and drill operator?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. You lifted your eyebrows as indicating that I might be wrong in asking you such a question. Did you make such a statement in your application at Graham Paper Co., namely, that you had worked at packinghouses as a punch and drill operator?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you tell the truth when you made your application to the Graham Paper Co.?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. You got your job on the basis of the statements you made in your application to the Graham Paper Co., did you not?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you believe if you had given truthful answers in your application for employment to the Graham Paper Co., that the Graham Paper Co. would have employed you in the capacity which it did?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you believe that the Graham Paper Co. would have employed you in the capacity in which you were employed and are employed if you had indicated to them the educational qualifications that you have from Stockton College?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. And do you think they would have employed you if you had told them truthfully what you had done from the day you graduated from college and until the date you made your application?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever disclose to the members of your union the fact that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever disclose to your union the fact that you had misrepresented your background to your employer when seeking employment in the Graham Paper Co.?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. Did the members of your union know of your fine educational background?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer for the same reason.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask this question:

Mr. Richardson, when did you say you began working at the Graham Paper Co.?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I believe the record shows that I said, to the best of my recollection, it was in the neighborhood of the last 3 years.

Mr. MOULDER. Now, according to the document presented by counsel as your application for employment, it was on October 12, 1953, when Edwin L. Richardson made the application for employment there.

Mr. WOLFF. What was that date, Mr. Moulder? I didn't quite get that.

Mr. MOULDER. According to the document presented by counsel as the application for warehouse employment with the Graham Paper Co., which is purported to be signed by Edwin L. Richardson, was it on October 12, 1953, when the application was made.

Now what caused you to seek employment with the Graham Paper Co.?

You stated that you have been working there during the past 3 years.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Who suggested that you seek employment with the Graham Paper Co.?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you, of your own personal knowledge, know that there was an opportunity for employment with the Graham Paper Co. before you made application for employment?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you requested or directed by the Communist Party to seek employment at the Graham Paper Co. when you made such application for employment?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Any further questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. FRAZIER. One more.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Richardson, during the period from 1948 to 1953, did you travel abroad during that time?

Mr. WOLFF. What was that question?

Mr. FRAZIER. I asked if Mr. Richardson traveled abroad during the period from 1948 to 1953, that is if he left the United States during that period.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. FRAZIER. Did you go to Russia during that time?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well, you are excused as a witness, Mr. Richardson.

And may I ask, Mr. Wolff, if you were assigned by the bar association to represent this man.

Mr. WOLFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. We wish to compliment you on your conduct in your appearance before the committee in representing your client. We are pleased to have you here in that capacity.

Thank you very much, Mr. Wolff.

Call the next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Anne (Ann) Yagur.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Kling.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Anne (Ann) Kling.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. KLING. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ANNE (ANN) YASGUR KLING, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, G. S. ROUDEBUSH

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. My name is G. S. Roudebush. I am a member of this bar, and represent Mrs. Kling.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. KLING. Anne (Ann) Ruth Kling.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your maiden name?

Mrs. KLING. Yagur, Y-a-s-g-u-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell your last name Kling?

Mrs. KLING. K-l-i-n-g.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

Mrs. KLING. 1445 Partridge Avenue, University City, postal zone 14, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mrs. KLING. In Bradford, Pa.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you move to St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. In the summer of 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been married?

Mrs. KLING. We were married January 1, 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment between 1944 in St. Louis and 1948, if any?

Mrs. KLING. I had various stenographic jobs, but I worked for the Communist Party in the Communist Party office for a period of time. And I sold subscriptions to New Masses magazine.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was the Communist Party headquarters located at the time you were employed in the office?

Mrs. KLING. I think it was on North 7th Street here in downtown St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. That employment began when?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I believe—I am not sure—sometime in the winter of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did the employment continue?

Mrs. KLING. I started about the winter of 1945 and, well, I left the party payroll at various times to take ordinary stenographic jobs,

and it was intermittent between the winter of 1945, probably, to the winter of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the Communist Party organizer in charge of the office during that period of time?

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, I will tell you anything that you want to know about myself and my activities, anything you want to know. I have nothing to conceal. I engaged in no criminal or no illegal activity.

But I am not a tattletale, and I don't want to snitch on anybody.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask for a direction that the witness answer the question?

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer. And, as other witnesses have been advised, we are not directing you to answer the question in the spirit of a threat but for the reason that the committee is not satisfied and does not accept your response to the question, and for the further reason advising you of the possibility of the dangers of contempt proceedings.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, my lawyer advises me that the question of exposure of other individuals simply for the ease of exposure is not a settled question in law, and until it is a settled question my conscience would prevent me from tattling on other people.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say that the full bench of the circuit court of appeals recently reversed a ruling of the three members of that court.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. May I be heard on that, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I am just saying—

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I should say that I spoke yesterday on the telephone to counsel for Watkins in that case, and he told me that he was applying for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. MOULDER. May I say, of course, that you are going under the presumption that we are merely seeking to expose somebody, which is not true. It is a wrong and false presumption.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. SCHERER. Don't you think we should further say now that we are now considering legislation and that testimony that this witness might give, if she would, would be helpful in that respect?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, we would take that position. Such information as you may be in a position to give us might aid this committee in its deliberations and consideration of legislation.

Now do you still wish to refuse to answer for the reasons which you have given?

Mrs. KLING. Yes. Telling on other people is an abhorrent thing to me.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Ralph Shaw?

Mrs. KLING. That is the same question essentially. You are asking me to identify a person, and I just can't identify other people. I wish you would ask me what I did, how I behaved.

Mr. SCHERER. You understand, madam, that that is not your responsibility as to whether you are going to tell what you know about other individuals.

Our society and our courts could not function if any witness that came into a court or into a congressional hearing took it upon himself to say that he is not going to tell what he knows about other people.

It is distasteful all of the time, even in the courtroom, for a person to come in and say that he saw his neighbor beat his wife. He may not want to say that, but merely because he likes that neighbor he can't refuse to tell the court, nor could he refuse to tell a congressional committee what he knows merely because it is distasteful to him.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. SCHERER. Our whole system of jurisprudence would fall if witnesses could take it upon themselves to say "I don't want to tell what I know about people merely because I don't like to do it, that it is distasteful."

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Ralph Shaw serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, as far as you know?

Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer the questions in relation to other individuals. I am relying somewhat on counsel's advice that this question of holding people up to public scorn is an open question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you substitute in any way and—

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

I think we have got to get this record straight, particularly insofar as this witness is concerned.

If witnesses could come in and say they just don't want to tell what they know about other people because it might have an unfavorable effect upon them—I think I must ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer the question.

Mrs. KLING. My conscience will not permit me to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. You are refusing to answer solely because your conscience will not permit you to answer?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. SCHERER. We should state for the record certainly this committee is not asking these questions for the purpose of exposing any individual. The committee is asking these questions so that it will be better enabled to recommend to the Congress such legislation as it thinks necessary to deal with the Communist conspiracy which still exists in this country.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received sworn testimony that Ralph Shaw was an organizer of the Communist Party in St. Louis, but that there was a period of time when he was absent while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Did you carry on the function of an organizer of the Communist Party at any time while Ralph Shaw was not here?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. I worked in the Communist Party office sometime during the winter of 1945, and I believe it continued to the winter of 1946 or thereabouts. I left, I quit the Communist Party in the summer of 1947. I have never attended any more Communist Party meetings. That was 9 years ago.

I understand that I was expelled for desertion.

That is the story.

Mr. SCHERER. Then you would have no way of knowing, madam, whether this man Shaw or any of the other individuals about whom Mr. Tavenner wants to inquire are still members of the Communist Party and are still active. You would have no way of knowing?

Mrs. KLING. That is true. That is absolutely true.

Mr. SCHERER. And it is possible that they might be?

Mrs. KLING. It is possible; yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Was Shaw a member of the Communist Party at the time you were there?

Mrs. KLING. I will answer any questions about myself.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct now the witness to answer the question as to whether Shaw was a member of the Communist Party because obviously he may still be a member of the Communist Party today and may still be engaged in subversive activities against this country.

And it may be that we will want to call Shaw or other people connected with Shaw to determine what the Communist conspiracy is doing at this present moment in this area. And, as the result, we may want to recommend legislation to the Congress of the United States to deal with the continued activities of the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. MOULDER. As requested by Mr. Scherer, the witness is informed that the committee does not accept your response to the question, and you are directed to answer.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. What was the question? Excuse me.

Mr. MOULDER. He asked you if——

Mr. SCHERER. If Shaw was a member of the Communist Party at the time she was.

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Scherer, my conscience will not permit me to name other individuals whom I may or may not have known during the 3 years—9 years ago—that I was in the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. Yet you understand that people who were in the Communist Party at the time you were there may still be in the Communist Party today?

Mrs. KLING. I have no way of knowing, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you tell us the name—I know you don't have any way of knowing—will you tell us then the names of such individuals who were members of the Communist Party when you were there who we may not even know about?

Mrs. KLING. I cannot sit here and be a tattletale, Mr. Scherer. I just can't do that kind of thing.

Mr. SCHERER. Then, as I understand it, you are refusing to answer my questions solely because you feel that your conscience will not permit you to tell us about individuals who were members of the Communist Party when you were a member of the Communist Party who may be members of the party today.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. Yes, Mr. Scherer, for that reason and for the further reason that it is still an open question as to whether the law compels information about individuals which may not serve a legislative purpose.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer my question.

Mr. MOULDER. Your response is not accepted by the committee, and you are directed to answer as requested by Mr. Scherer.

Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer.

Mr. MOULDER. All right. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not answer the question that I asked you. My question was whether or not during the absence of Mr. Shaw you carried on the functions of an organizer of the Communist Party in St. Louis.

Mrs. KLING. Let's see. What exactly did I do?

I don't know that you would call it an organizer. I wrote leaflets. I ran them off on a mimeograph. I may have distributed them on the street corners. I participated actively. I don't believe I ever had the appellation "organizer."

Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether you served in that capacity during the absence of Mr. Shaw. It would be very easy for you to answer that question "yes" or "no" according to whatever the facts are.

Mrs. KLING. Well, I would say——

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. I was not an organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you if you carried on the duties of an organizer of the Communist Party during the absence of Mr. Shaw.

Mrs. KLING. The duties as an organizer, yes, I suppose that would be so, never being termed an organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Though you did not have the title of an organizer you carried on the work of Mr. Shaw when Mr. Shaw was in the Army; didn't you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. I was carrying on work that might be called that of an organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ralph Shaw was your brother-in-law; wasn't he?

Mrs. KLING. I will not bring in names, according to my conscience.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness——

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me, Mr. Scherer.

(Mr. Tavenner confers with the committee.)

Mr. MOULDER. The request is made that you be directed to answer, and you are so directed.

Mrs. KLING. Excuse me. The question again, please?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the witness the question?

(Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter, as follows:)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ralph Shaw was your brother-in-law; wasn't he?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you been a member of the Communist Party before you accepted employment in the Communist Party headquarters?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where did you join the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. In St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. In St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. In the summer of 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you participated as an instructor in the basic training institute of the Communist Party.

Mrs. KLING. Will you explain what you mean by basic training institute?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, let me ask you this:

Did the Communist Party organize a school in 1946?

Mrs. KLING. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you teach in a school, a Communist Party school?

Mrs. KLING. I may have taught some classes. I don't believe I ever taught in anything that was called a school.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you call it?

Mrs. KLING. They were informal classes, organized.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about them.

Mrs. KLING. Informal classes organized in which current events were studied.

My memory really is bad. That is 10 years ago. It is hard to tell what was done.

Mr. TAVENNER. History of the Soviet Union. Was that one of the things that you studied?

Mrs. KLING. It could be, but I honestly don't recall.

Mr. TAVENNER. You don't recall.

Mr. MOULDER. What subject did you teach?

Mrs. KLING. I think it was economics, but I am not positive. It may have been on surplus value, but I couldn't swear to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you get your training for the purpose of teaching that subject?

Mrs. KLING. I think mainly I read books on my own.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. No. I think I started when I was a senior in college.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time before coming to St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. No. I was a member of the Young Communist League in college, and, as a member of the Young Communist League, I wasn't a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. At what college was that?

Mrs. KLING. Missouri University.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you enter Missouri University?

Mrs. KLING. The fall of 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. Missouri University is at Columbia. I understood you first came to Missouri in 1944.

Mrs. KLING. I came to St. Louis in 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. You came to St. Louis in 1944. When did you come first to the State of Missouri?

Mrs. KLING. The fall of 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was to attend Missouri University?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you been a member of the Young Communist League before coming to Missouri?

Mrs. KLING. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us at this time, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mrs. KLING. I have an A. B. degree from the University of Missouri granted in June of 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a group of the Young Communist League composed of students at Missouri University?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it organized by a functionary of the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. Well, it was already organized when I got there. So I couldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it continuing in full bloom when you left there?

Mrs. KLING. I don't know how full-bloomy it was. I believe it was still going when I left.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know whether it was going, don't you? It is not a matter of just believing. You know?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I wasn't there. I can't tell you for sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. I said when you left.

Mrs. KLING. When I left. Oh, yes, all right. When I left I guess it was still going.

Mr. SCHERER. Were there any professors active in the Young Communist League as advisers or otherwise?

Mrs. KLING. No; not that I know of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did functionaries of the Communist Party appear in your Young Communist League meetings from time to time?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I will have to think because that was 1943-44. That is 12 and 13 years ago and I really will have to think.

Whether anybody—well, it could be but I couldn't say for sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any functionary of the Communist Party who appeared before your group ever confer with you after leaving college about your becoming a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. You know I think that when I left college I was so dedicated that I just went up to the Communist Party office and joined.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Columbia or in St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. In St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. In St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long a period of time before 1944 had you considered yourself a dedicated Communist?

Mrs. KLING. Well, maybe I used the word dedicated ill-advisedly, but I was probably—let's see.

I was a member of the Young Communist League toward the end of 1943 and through 1944, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, please, who employed you first in the Communist Party headquarters in St. Louis.

Mrs. KLING. Well, that would involve more names, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, it would involve a name.

Mrs. KLING. And I think that I will just wait and see what the Supreme Court has to say on this.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask a direction of the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mrs. KLING. My conscience will not permit me to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons were employed in the headquarters besides you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. I think the Communist Party payroll at that time consisted of 2 persons, myself and one other.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was that other person?

Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that other person the organizer or was it a fellow employee, another person employed by the organizer? (The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. Well, when the men went off to the Army the women of the Communist Party were supposed to take over and run things. But nobody got titles as far as I can remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. But when the leadership of the Communist Party went in the Army their wives took over?

Mrs. KLING. I don't know that they were necessarily wives.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or the men took over?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. You said "or the men took over."

Mr. TAVENNER. No. The women took over.

Mrs. KLING. Yes, I think that when the men went off to war women entered the factories to become riveters, et cetera. That is probably what happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were one of those who wanted to keep the Communist Party going until the men got back?

Mrs. KLING. Yes, I guess you would say that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you maintain a list of the membership of the Communist Party at the time that you acted in that capacity?

Mrs. KLING. There were lists of members. And I would address envelopes and ask members to attend meetings. Yes, lists were available to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the dues secretary?

Mrs. KLING. No, I wasn't the dues secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was?

Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer that question, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interpose one question.

You know who the dues secretary was, though, do you not?

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Scherer, I don't really remember. I honestly don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any list of the membership?

Mrs. KLING. Now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. KLING. Oh, no. I left the party 9 years ago. And then I was expelled for desertion. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did the Communist Party raise the money with which to carry on its operations during the period of time you were serving in the capacity you have described?

Mrs. KLING. I think it was mainly contributions from members.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, without any opposition on your part or the members or Mr. Williams, we will recess, and the committee will stand in recess until 2 p. m.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., the committee was recessed until 2 p. m., this same day, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1956

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, at 2:15 p. m., there being present at the time of reconvening Representatives Morgan M. Moulder, James B. Frazier, Jr., and Gordon H. Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Call your next witness.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. She has been sworn.

**TESTIMONY OF ANNE (ANN) YASGUR KLING, ACCOMPANIED BY
HER COUNSEL, G. S. ROUDEBUSH—Resumed**

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Kling, I believe you said in your testimony this morning that you became a member of the Communist Party in 1944, very soon after your arrival in St. Louis.

Mrs. KLING. Yes; I believe that is true.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your purpose in coming to St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I was a graduate from school, and I decided, rather than going back to the small town from which I came, I wanted to live in a large city.

Mr. TAVENNER. And where was the small town from which you came?

Mrs. KLING. In northwest Pennsylvania—Bradford.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bradford. That is just outside of Pittsburgh; isn't it?

Mrs. KLING. No. It is about one-hundred-some-odd miles north. It is closer to Erie.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did you select St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I had become familiar with St. Louis, being at Columbia, Mo., and it seemed like a nice city to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You had visited here frequently during the period of time that you were in attendance at college at Columbia?

Mrs. KLING. Not frequently, but on weekends or for a Sunday.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any Communist Party contacts here in St. Louis during the period of those visits?

Mrs. KLING. I think they were Young Communist League contacts rather than party, although I really couldn't tell you whether those I saw were members of the Young Communist League or the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend meetings of the Young Communist League here in St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. I think that I came to one Young Communist League convention in the spring of 1944, but I can't swear to the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did those connections with the membership of the Young Communist League influence you in coming to St. Louis to make this your place of residence?

Mrs. KLING. Yes. The fact that I had become acquainted with a few people might have influenced me, although actually I wanted to live in a large city, and I didn't want to live in a small town.

Mr. TAVENNER. How soon after you became a member of the Communist Party in 1944 was it you became employed in the headquarters, Communist Party headquarters in this city?

Mrs. KLING. I can't give you the exact time, but I believe it may have been around February or March of 1945. But my memory on that is faulty. I was employed but I can't give you the exact date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Specifically what office was it in which you were employed? Was it on a district level or city level?

Mrs. KLING. I think it was on the district level. Yes, I think it was the district.

Mr. TAVENNER. The district level. And the district at that time consisted of the States of Missouri and Arkansas, did it not?

Mrs. KLING. You know I have forgotten. You may be right. You may be right.

Mr. TAVENNER. There were at that time organized groups of the Communist Party not only in St. Louis but in what is referred to as outstate Missouri. Isn't that true?

Mrs. KLING. Yes, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Kansas City and other places.

Did you say "yes"?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the position that you spoke of in the district headquarters?

Mrs. KLING. Let's see——

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say until 1947? I understood you to so state.

Mrs. KLING. No, it wasn't—I don't believe—I think it was toward the end of 1946 that I was no longer employed, but I am not absolutely sure.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In your earlier testimony you stated 1947, I understood.

Mrs. KLING. My lawyer advises me that you may be confusing the date I left the party with the date I left working directly for the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. If you will give us the facts, whatever they are.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any document or memorandum that you could use to refresh your recollection?

Mrs. KLING. No, I am sorry I don't. I am trying very hard to remember for you.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. This paper she is looking at, Mr. Tavenner, is notes that I made of what she told me.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is quite all right.

Mrs. KLING. As far as I can remember, I sold subscriptions to New Masses magazine from around the fall of 1945 until January of 1946.

No, that wouldn't be right.

And I worked at the Communist Party office from around the winter of 1945—yes, this is correct—until the winter of around 1946. I believe this is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. The winter of 1946?

Mrs. KLING. I honestly can't swear to this. I realize I am under oath, and I don't want to make a mistake.

Mr. TAVENNER. All I want you to do is to be as nearly correct as you can.

I believe you said you left the Communist Party in 1947.

Mrs. KLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What time in 1947?

Mrs. KLING. It was somewhere in the summer, June or July, possibly August, of 1947 I stopped attending meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any Communist Party meetings after June or July, 1947?

Mrs. KLING. I don't believe so, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not certain?

Mrs. KLING. Let's see.

I am fairly certain, but that is 9 years ago. And while I am under oath I am not going to say 9 years ago——

Mr. TAVENNER. You could be mistaken about that?

Mrs. KLING. Possibly, possibly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not it was the practice in the Communist Party to require the membership to subscribe for the Daily Worker?

Mrs. KLING. Yes; I think members were—they wanted the members to read the paper; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why?

Mrs. KLING. I suppose to inform them on their stand on current events.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not correct that the Daily Worker carried the Communist Party line, the decisions of the Communist Party, which the membership should follow?

Mrs. KLING. Yes; that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the activity of Grace Granich in procuring directives from the Soviet Union and having them carried as news articles in the Daily Worker for the purpose of informing the membership of the Communist Party as to the Communist decisions?

Mrs. KLING. I have never heard of——

Is it a woman?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. KLING. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you continue to subscribe to the Daily Worker to a much later date than 1947?

Mrs. KLING. I may have. I don't think I did, but I may have. I know I wasn't subscribing to it in 1948; I am pretty sure I wasn't. But I can't honestly, you know, say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive it regularly in 1948?

Mrs. KLING. I don't really remember. I don't think so. But I don't honestly remember.

I may have wanted to let the subscription run out and get the paper for nothing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why were you interested in receiving the Daily Worker after you had withdrawn from the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I really——

You apparently have information that I did, and I guess if you have it then it is correct. But I can't remember that I was interested. I probably was letting a subscription take its normal course and didn't stop it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Kling, I have read into evidence a document entitled "Proposed Plan for Missouri State Building Conference,

March 2 and 3, 1946," which set forth the Communist Party plan for Missouri. This was at a period when you were in the district office of the Communist Party in St. Louis.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, may I interrupt to announce we are pleased and honored to have with us Congressman Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, floor leader of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

I would like to read to you this part of the document. The heading of this part of the document is:

The minimum requirements for fulfilling concentration tasks:

It is proposed that the minimum number of recruits shall come from the following industries:

AFL—25, electrical—25, shoe—25 (including AFL shoe workers).

Packing—25, including KC—

which may mean Kansas City.

Auto—15, including KC.

Railroad—15, including KC. Outstate—25.

Youth and vets—25.

Negro and professionals—100 as a general minimum figure.

It is proposed that new branches and clubs shall be organized in the following places—

I will refer to that a little later.

Do you recall at this time the success attained by the Communist Party in meeting the minimum requirements for fulfilling the concentration tasks in 1946?

Mrs. KLING. The Communist Party was always having party-building conferences. They were always putting up goals to be met. And I honestly don't remember whether those aims were achieved or not. I rather think they weren't, but I couldn't swear to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing to read the document:

It is proposed that new branches and clubs shall be organized in the following places:

Five additional shop branches, at least one of these in KC.

County clubs in Overland, Kinloch, and Kirkwood.

Do you recall whether clubs were organized in Overland, Kinloch, and Kirkwood?

Mrs. KLING. No, I really don't know.

Now, I went to Kansas City for several months in 1946—I don't know whether you have that information or not—in an attempt to recruit members and build up the Kansas City party. Success was not too great, and I returned to St. Louis, I think, in the fall or the early winter months of 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. In Kansas City did you work among the railroad group referred to in this document, in which it was said that there should be 15 recruited in railroad, including Kansas City.

Mrs. KLING. I don't believe I ever worked directly with any railroad group. I don't think there were any 15 members either.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many were there?

Mrs. KLING. Well, let me see. 10 years ago. There may have been 2 or 3.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard testimony here that Otto Wangerin—

Mrs. KLING. What is the name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Otto Wangerin, a Communist Party functionary on a national level and one of the members of the railroad unit of the Communist Party—as it was described by the witness but which we think meant that he was one of the railroad commission of the Communist Party on a national level—came here to St. Louis and met with the Communist Party here for the purpose of concentrating work among railroad employees. The testimony is that he stated to the St. Louis group of Communists that the railroads were of vital importance to the Communist Party, that the very life of a democracy such as ours depends upon transportation, and no revolution could be complete unless the Communist Party controlled the railroads.

Do you recall the appearance of Mr. Otto Wangerin?

Mrs. KLING. I really don't. I don't recall him at all. The name isn't familiar to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you state that here in St. Louis there were 2 or 3 members of the railroad group.

Mrs. KLING. No. You misunderstood me. I don't know what they had at St. Louis in the railroad group. I was talking about Kansas City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Kansas City. There were 2 or 3 in Kansas City?

Mrs. KLING. As far as I know and can remember now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether Harold Hall was a member of the railroad group here in St. Louis?

Mrs. KLING. Well, there we come to names again, and I honestly didn't know anything about the railroad group at St. Louis.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you know Harold Hall?

Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer that, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. As requested by Mr. Scherer, the witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. You are refusing to answer it on the basis that your conscience will not permit you to answer?

Mrs. KLING. But not only that; but also that there may be an open legal question as to whether mere naming of names serves the purpose that the committee desires.

Mr. SCHERER. We settled that this morning.

Mr. TAVENNER. I assure you that this is no question of merely naming of names. There is information indicating that Mr. Hall is an important member of the Communist Party in St. Louis today. Your testimony on his activities and just what his activities were in the Communist Party may be of vital importance to us if you will give it to us.

Mr. SCHERER. For the purpose of determining legislation which the committee now has and presently has under consideration.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mrs. KLING. Well, frankly I didn't have much to do with the industrial end of the party. I was more, well, how to put it—

I don't believe I ever planned any of this, whatever it is that you are driving at. My own interests in the ideology were on an intellectual level, and I can't say that I ever concentrated in this area that you are talking about at all. I don't know the workings of it.

Mr. TAVENNER. The intellectuals in the Communist Party were used by the Communist Party to aid in recruiting in industry, in railroads and in other vital areas in which the Communist Party was interested. Isn't that true? Wasn't that one of the principal functions of the intellectuals in the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I will say this for myself personally, that I don't recall signing up any member who was in industry. I myself didn't do this.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking your knowledge about things, not only just what you yourself did. You have told us that you were active in the headquarters of the Communist Party performing the duties normally exercised by an organizer while the leadership of the Communist Party was in the war. You have indicated that you have special knowledge of those things.

Now we would like to know from you who were members known to you of the railroad group of the Communist Party.

Mrs. KLING. Well, Mr. Tavenner, for the major period of my activities in the party the party operated on a neighborhood basis. They had a South Side Branch and they had a West Side Branch. And I don't recall my participating in any industrial conference or working with any industrial unit. I was working with the neighborhood branches which were organized on the basis of where people lived and not where they worked.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, she has evaded answering the question of counsel, and I ask you to direct her to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness has been evasive, and the committee does respectfully direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. KLING. I am sorry. I don't want to be evasive. I will try to answer the question. Would you ask me again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Will you read the question, please.

Mr. SCHERER. The question was whether or not she knew the names of those individuals who were in the railroad segment of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for the exact question to be read. (Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter as follows:)

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking your knowledge about things, not only just what you yourself did. You have told us that you were active in the headquarters of the Communist Party performing the duties normally exercised by an organizer while the leadership of the Communist Party was in the war. You have indicated that you have special knowledge of those things.

Now we would like to know from you who were members known to you of the railroad group of the Communist Party.

Mrs. KLING. Well, I have to say that I cannot tell names.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is redirected to answer the question.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. Excuse me.

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed by the committee to answer the question.

Mrs. KLING. Well, on the grounds of conscience and the question, the open legal question of exposure, I will have to decline the answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. This very document, issued on the 3d day of March 1946, states that:

In this campaign the aim of every comrade must be to recruit only those who will be active, who will contribute to achieve the following qualitative and quantitative improvements of our party organization.

And one of the qualitative items is this:

Qualitative improvement in the existing neighborhood clubs and organization of series of new clubs in the important political and industrial sections.

And you have told us that you went to Kansas City for several months that same year after that time and engaged in recruiting work.

Mrs. KLING. Trying to recruit.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said that there were 2 or 3 members of the railroad group in Kansas City. Who were they?

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, I honestly don't remember their names. That is 10 years ago, and I don't remember their names.

Mr. MOULDER. If you could remember would you tell us?

Mrs. KLING. No, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. If I may, as we do in court, object to the question as to what she might do.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this document, issued in March of 1946, pursuant to which you engaged in recruiting work, appears this statement:

Following are some of the proposed assignments:

Electrical—

and then the name "Dottie" appears after that, and the name "Zollie." We have had testimony here that Dottie referred to a Mrs. James Sage. We have heard testimony that Zollie referred to Zollie Carpenter.

Do you know to whom the name "Bill" referred as one of those responsible for electric?

Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer for the reasons I gave heretofore.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is respectfully directed to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. The designation—

Excuse me.

Mrs. KLING. I am sorry but I cannot answer the question on the basis of the previous explanation.

Mr. MOULDER. You mean you refuse to answer for the same reasons previously stated?

Mrs. KLING. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. The designation of youth is made with the names after it of Ray and Sue.

We have heard evidence that Ray referred to Ray Wolverin.

Do you know to whom the name "Sue" refers?

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, I will have to decline to answer that because I cannot be a tattletale, and also because there is a question of whether naming certain names would be helpful to the developing of legislation on these matters.

Mr. TAVENNER. The reference to packing is made here with the names following it of Joe and Helen. Do you know to whom those names refer?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I decline to answer for the same reasons, the same two reasons given in my previous answers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't Helen Musiel a functionary of the Communist Party here in March of 1946? By here I mean in St. Louis.

Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Helen Musiel is a witness that we have under subpoena for this very hearing and who has failed to answer that subpoena because of an alleged defect in the subpoena. So it can be readily seen why this witness' testimony with reference to Helen Musiel is important.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mrs. KLING. I will decline to answer that. You are questioning me about things that occurred 10 years ago. A lot of the questions I honestly couldn't answer if I wanted to. But I will have to continue to decline the naming of other people because that kind of thing is just abhorrent to me.

Mr. SCHERER. The matter of Helen Musiel is a very present matter before this committee. Any information that you have regarding Helen Musiel is vitally important to this committee.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you honestly answer the question I asked you regarding Helen Musiel, if you desired to answer it?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. That seems a hypothetical question.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. You said that there are some people that you could not honestly answer. I am asking you if you can honestly answer that question as to Helen Musiel.

Mrs. KLING. And the original question was, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Was whether or not Helen Musiel was a functionary of the Communist Party in March 1946.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. My best recollection is that I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you work in the same office with her?

Mrs. KLING. In March of 1946?

Mr. TAVENNER. Any time in 1946.

Mrs. KLING. There we are on names again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; it is the same name that you couldn't remember a moment ago.

Mrs. KLING. No. I was answering your specific question as to a specific time, Mr. Tavenner, before. Now you are asking a more general question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. You are unable to answer as to the specific date of March 2 or 3.

Can you honestly answer the question as to whether she was a functionary of the Communist Party at any time?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. That is another question, sir. And I cannot answer a question like that.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question because it is vitally important. And what happened here this morning demonstrates the fallacy of the position she takes.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer for the previous reasons given.

Mr. MOULDER. May I also ask you, do you know Helen Musiel? Are you acquainted with Helen Musiel?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I will have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. And the committee cannot accept that response to the question. You are directed to answer the question.

I said the committee cannot accept that reason for refusing to answer that question, and you are directed to answer.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. In view of the context of the question in relation to what happened this morning, the nonappearance of this person, I would like to state that as of now I know nothing about this person.

Mr. MOULDER. As of what?

Mrs. KLING. As of now I know nothing about this person.

Mr. MOULDER. I asked you if you were acquainted with her.

Mrs. KLING. Well, I decline to answer, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever know her?

Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer on the basis of the previous reasons given.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. When was the last time you saw Helen Musiel?

Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. When was the last time you had any contact with Helen Musiel?

Mrs. KLING. I cannot name names here of other people.

I am willing to tell you whatever you want to know about myself and what I did.

Mr. MOULDER. In connection with that I would like to ask a question.

You say you left the Communist Party and were no longer officially associated with it in the year of 1947?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean you left your association and official capacity or did you sever your relations with the Communist Party completely?

Mrs. KLING. Well, at the time that I stopped attending meetings I was not on the payroll of the Communist Party, and I had private employment as a stenographer in a nonpolitical way.

Mr. MOULDER. Then I wish to ask you this question:

Do you know or have you any knowledge of a meeting held by witnesses who were subpoenaed to appear before this committee a few days prior to the convening of the committee of this hearing wherein there was a meeting and discussion on how they would refuse to testify and the manner in which they would conduct themselves in their appearance before the committee?

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Moulder, I have been reading the papers closely ever since I received my subpoena, and the only knowledge I have of such a gathering was a statement in a story in the Post-Dispatch several days ago.

Mr. MOULDER. Then you were not present at such a meeting?

Mrs. KLING. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

Now, coming back to your testimony concerning your severing of your relations with the Communist Party, you were a teacher, as I

understand it, that taught one of the classes at a Communist Party meeting or school?

Mrs. KLING. Well, at various times during my membership I taught classes.

Mr. MOULDER. Therefore, you were evidently familiar with the philosophy and ideology and the objects of the Communist Party in the United States, were you not?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I thought so at the time, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Now at the time you believed in those objects and philosophy and purposes of the Communist Party, did you not?

Mrs. KLING. Well, let's say I believed in my interpretation of them.

Mr. MOULDER. Now have you since you have severed your active association with the Communist Party changed your opinion and belief in the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. Well, sir, I think that the Communist Party in this country has become sort of a joke.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean to say that at that time that you considered it a joke, in 1947?

Mrs. KLING. When I was a member I didn't, but I came to see—

Mr. MOULDER. Then you have changed your attitude and opinion of it since then?

Mrs. KLING. Yes; I believe I have.

Mr. MOULDER. You believe you have?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you been approached by persons since you failed to attend Communist Party meetings to return as a member of the party?

Mrs. KLING. Now, let's see. I don't believe so, sir. I don't believe that anybody ever came and asked me to come back into the Communist Party. I think I avoided those contacts that might lead to that kind of thing.

Mr. MOULDER. Why did you stop going to Communist Party meetings?

Mrs. KLING. Well, that is a complex question and it involves my personal life. But I will tell you the plain, unvarnished truth about it.

I met a young man with whom I fell in love and he strongly disapproved of my membership and activities. And, well, then I just stopped going to meetings because of that.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you now disapprove of the Communist Party activities and its objectives and purposes?

Mrs. KLING. Yes; I believe I do.

Mr. MOULDER. And philosophy in this country?

Mrs. KLING. I believe I do; yes, sir.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, please, whether or not Helen Musiel worked in the same office with you?

Mrs. KLING. Excuse me.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. We are finished. Go right ahead. I don't believe she heard the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether Helen Musiel worked in the same office in the district headquarters of the Communist Party with you?

Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer because it involves naming another individual, and I don't want to injure other people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another notation from the document of March 2 is "Auto" followed by the name Maries; Maries.

Do you know to whom Marie refers?

Mrs. KLING. Gosh, I might and I might not, sir. So I will just have to decline on the basis that I do not want to harm other individuals.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is also the notation "Railroad" after which is the name Helen. Is that the same Helen who had the responsibility for packing house?

Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that on the same grounds previously given.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I want at this time also to refer to Schoemehl Exhibit 1. This is a Communist Party document entitled "Organization Department, Report to Clubs, April 14, 1947" and it reads as follows, or at least part of it does:

Following consultation with the national organization commission of our party, the Missouri State board has made a number of important decisions. These decisions are for the purpose of strengthening our party and its leadership in order that our party can fulfill its role in organizing and leading the struggles of our class and our people in Missouri. These decisions on organization include:

1. That the Missouri district implement immediately and seriously its concentration policy in the electrical and machine industry by establishing a concentration section plus the assignment of one full-time person to head the concentration work.

Who was appointed as a fulltime person to head that concentration work; if you know?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. I honestly don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know?

Mrs. KLING. No, sir. If I did know at one time I can't remember now.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Communist Party did concentrate in the electrical and machine industry; did it not?

Mrs. KLING. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time Ray Koch, who signed this document as organizational secretary, was in fact the organizational secretary; was he not?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. That is a name.

I will have to decline to answer, Mr. Tavenner, on the same grounds that I won't tattle on other people.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are certainly not tattling on Ray Koch whose name is appended to this document as organizational secretary.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. Well, if that is what the document says that is what it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you serve under him?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. That is a name question again.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mrs. KLING. That involves my disclosing a relationship with someone else, which might do harm to him because of my membership at the time. And so I have to decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. What was the reason for declining to answer that question? Would you repeat that?

Mrs. KLING. That if I answered it might—well, if I were asked if I knew Joe Blow in 1946 and I said I did he might get in trouble because it might be assumed that since I was a member that he was a member.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about your Government?

Mrs. KLING. I have a high respect for my Government.

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't you think your Government will get in difficulty if it doesn't do something about the Communist business, that the Congress may understand what is going on in the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. Well, what is going on? I don't know what is going on in the Communist Party, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. And the only way we can find out is to call before this committee persons who do know. And you are in a position to give us the information as to some of the persons who may still be very active in the organization here in the city at this moment.

Mrs. KLING. Well, I don't know that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now I want to ask you this question:

In this original document which I mentioned to you, the one bearing date of March 2 and 3, 1946, reference is made to this, that there should be established at least one professional cell of the Communist Party.

What is meant by a professional cell of the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. Well, my interpretation of that would be it would be composed of people who were in the professions, the arts and sciences, law.

Mr. TAVENNER. The intellectuals?

Mrs. KLING. Yes, I suppose you could say that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you were one of the intellectuals. Were you a member of a professional cell of the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. No; I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a professional cell of the Communist Party during the period that you were active in the district headquarters?

Mrs. KLING. Let's see.

I honestly don't remember. My impression now is that the professionals were in the neighborhood clubs that I mentioned before. Now I am not sure about this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection.

We have had testimony from Mr. Schoemehl, who was in the Communist Party at the instance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during the period of time that you were—

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Here is a man who testified before this committee under oath and admitted his membership in the Communist Party and told why he was in the Communist Party.

Did you know Mr. Schoemehl?

Mrs. KLING. I don't want to bring in any names.

Mr. SCHERER. You don't want to bring in any names because it might hurt that individual. How could it hurt Mr. Schoemehl? Mr. Schoemehl appeared before us on Saturday in executive session

under oath and admitted his membership in the Communist Party, and told why he was in the Communist Party, and gave us an abundance of testimony.

Now what happens to your argument or your statement that it is going to hurt him for you to tell us whether you knew Schoemehl?

Mrs. KLING. Even on Schoemehl I am willing to say what I did, and talk about party structure and so forth, but not names.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I think that we have demonstrated here the utter fallacy of the position of this witness. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question whether she knew Schoemehl.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer on the grounds as previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, you said here you are going to tell all that you did in the Communist Party. How can you possibly hurt Schoemehl? We want to know what you and Schoemehl did in the Communist Party. He is willing for you to tell what he did, as far as he is concerned.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. Well, these are matters of individual conscience. And because Mr. Schoemehl's conscience is not precisely that of mine in this regard, then I cannot follow in his footsteps. Just because one person does something doesn't mean that another person has to.

Mr. SCHERER. Now Mr. Schoemehl told us about you, told us you were a member of the Communist Party.

Mrs. KLING. All right.

Mr. SCHERER. In that respect he was telling the truth, wasn't he?

Mrs. KLING. Yes, he was. And I have nothing to hide, Mr. Scherer, on that basis.

Mr. SCHERER. Then you knew him, did you not?

Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. What was your activity with Schoemehl in the Communist Party?

It isn't funny. This is serious.

Mrs. KLING. I am only smiling out of nervousness, Mr. Scherer. I am not very happy here, you understand.

As a matter of fact——

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you about finished with this witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Will you tell us more about the professional cells of the Communist Party. Were they not considered as supersecret, that the membership of a professional cell of the Communist Party was not to be known even by other Communist Party members other than those on the very highest levels?

Mrs. KLING. When I was a member and worker in the Communist Party the structure was very loose. And while the rule may have been that nobody was to know about any professional cell in actual practice people did know each other. And I think probably the chief difference in the form of activity was that the professionals met in homes, each other's homes instead of going to party headquarters.

Mr. TAVENNER. They, in fact, were told not to be at meetings where other members of the Communist Party would see them or

know of their identity as members of the Communist Party. Isn't that correct?

Mrs. KLING. I am not sure. I never heard of a specific directive along that line, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was what was expected of them, wasn't it?

Mrs. KLING. I can't honestly say.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes, Mr. Tavenner.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Kling, there is a bill pending in Congress now providing certain requirements for members of the legal profession in appearance before congressional committees and in courts with regard to their possible membership in the Communist Party. It is a subject which the chairman of this committee, in December of 1955 while in the course of hearings in Chicago, directed the staff to make a study of and report to the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. That was the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the full committee, yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Walter.

Mr. TAVENNER. Part of the consideration which the committee has been giving has been the activity of lawyers who are members of the National Lawyers Guild and who, at the instance of the Communist Party, have infiltrated that organization. Those lawyers, wherever we have found them, have been members of a professional cell of the Communist Party, the membership of which has been kept ultra secret. That is one of the reasons that we are endeavoring to discover the extent, the character, and extent of a professional cell of the Communist Party which is reported to be here in St. Louis.

In the position that you occupied, although it was as long ago as 1946, it seems to me that with the handling of the literature of the Communist Party out of district headquarters, and all the other information that would come to a person in the position that you were in, that you would know about the membership of the professional group of the Communist Party here at that time.

Now is there any way in which you can aid the committee in regard to that? And when I say aid the committee I am not only speaking of names; I am speaking of the method by which the professional group of the Communist Party operated.

Mrs. KLING. Well, Mr. Tavenner, as I stated before I honestly don't remember whether at that time when I was working for the Communist Party there was a separate professional cell. I am not sure about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection. I started to do that a moment ago.

The committee has received sworn testimony by Mr. Schoemehl that in 1938, which was before you became connected with the party here, the district organizer of the Communist Party assigned Dr. Sol Londe and the person who later became his wife to the organization of a professional cell of the Communist Party in St. Louis, and that

Dr. Londe presented to him, Mr. Schoemehl, a directive to permit him to attend Communist Party meetings which were being conducted by Mr. Schoemehl so that they could become acquainted with the method by which Communist Party meetings were operated.

Mr. Schoemehl testified that Dr. Londe and the person who later became his wife, whose name I do not recall—and I am not certain that it is in evidence—attended 2 or possibly 3 of such meetings.

Now does that refresh your recollection as to the existence of a Communist Party cell when you became a member in 1944 or at any time while you were a member?

Mrs. KLING. Well, the structure of the structure of the Communist Party was constantly changing. The party was always trying to restructure itself in the branches and so on in order to find ways and means of a more efficient operation, make sure more members got to meetings, and so on.

I believe that from 1944 to 1945 the Communist Party was called the Communist Political Association. And I believe they dropped the cell structure, and that the groups met on a neighborhood basis.

Now there may have—

When it was restructured again after the establishment of the Communist Party they may have again established a professional cell. I can't swear to it. It could be. As far as I know, there could have been a professional cell at the time I was working in the Communist Party office. And I really can't remember whether it was at the time there were neighborhood groups or regular professional groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was Dr. Sol Londe a member of the Communist Party during the period that you were a member of the party?

Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer on the basis that I don't want to tattle on other people, and that it is an open question as to whether this—

The same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee cannot accept that response to the question, nor your reason for refusing to answer, and we respectfully direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the policy of the Communist Party at the time you were a member with regard to its membership being active in mass organizations?

Mrs. KLING. Oh, the Communist Party was always eager to extend its influence and to put over its ideas with as many people as possible. And the members were supposed to behave in an exemplary fashion, and by the force of their behavior to convince other people that what they believed was the correct thing to believe.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask—pardon me, Mr. Tavenner—do you know Dr. Londe?

Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. For the same reason previously stated by you?

Mrs. KLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. And the committee makes the same statement: We cannot accept that as a reason for refusing to answer, and you are directed to answer.

Mrs. KLING. Well, I will have to decline to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. Bearing in mind, if you will, the question did not ask you as to whether or not Dr. Londe was a Communist, or refer to

any associations between you and him as Communists, but just a pure and simple question as to whether or not you are acquainted with him.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you finished?

Would you answer the question, please.

Mrs. KLING. Yes, I have been acquainted with Dr. Londe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with him between 1944 and 1947?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. Mr. Moulder asked me a simple question and I gave a truthful answer. And now you are going to try to involve me in naming names in connection with party activities, and I cannot do that.

Mr. MOULDER. Mrs. Kling, may I plead with you. I think probably you don't—I will ask you a question.

Do you realize the seriousness and the threat of communism as a world conspiracy which seeks to control all free countries?

Mrs. KLING. Well, do you want a personal opinion on this?

Mr. MOULDER. You don't recognize or see that danger in communism?

Mrs. KLING. Well, what I don't as an individual see is the value of naming a few people around St. Louis——

Mr. MOULDER. Our object here is to ascertain information which you possess, that you frankly refuse to give for the reasons which you have stated, which the committee does not accept.

I remind you, and I am trying to impress upon you the seriousness of the threat of communism to our democracy, our Nation and all other free countries. And we are seeking to obtain information from you which would aid our Congress, the Congress of the United States, to be better informed to consider legislation to protect our national security against communism under a world-wide conspiracy of communism.

I am pointing that out to you so that you, as an American citizen, can cooperate with this committee in helping us secure legislation and take other steps that might be necessary to protect our national security.

Mrs. KLING. Well, I appreciate the high purpose of the committee, but as it involves my individual values as to telling on other people——

Mr. MOULDER. But that is the very point.

Don't you think that your own Government and your own country's welfare and freedom and security is far higher and above the position which you take in connection with individuals, which you take in protecting individuals? Don't you think that our Nation's welfare and security is far more important than that?

Mrs. KLING. I can only answer that a person has to live with himself and with his own conscience. And I couldn't undertake to name a few people that I may or may not remember as being active 9 years ago when I was a member of the party.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr. entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. SCHERER. Madam, would you take that same position if a very close friend and associate of yours had been engaged in violating the

Federal Narcotics Act and come in here before our committee and say you just don't want to tell what he did insofar as dispensing narcotics? Would you take that same position if you had that information about him?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I think that involves something criminal. And I don't feel I was engaged—I never did anything illegal or criminal.

Mr. SCHERER. We didn't say that you did anything illegal. But the courts have held that the Communist Party is not a political party as we know parties, political parties in this country, but that the Communist Party is part and parcel of an international, criminal conspiracy far greater than any conspiracy to violate the Narcotics Act of the Federal Government. It is the greatest criminal conspiracy the world has ever known. It has been definitely established as such by the decisions of the courts. And the Congress of the United States has said so.

So when you say that is a different situation that I presented to you, it is not a different situation at all.

In fact, as I have said, the Communist conspiracy certainly is a far more dangerous thing to the security and welfare of this country than is a violation of the Narcotics Act of this country.

I just wanted to demonstrate to you that the responsibility isn't upon you any more; it is upon the Congress. If it is in the courts it rests upon the court or the people as a whole. And when you are subpoenaed to come and testify what you know you are relieved of any personal responsibility.

As I tried to explain to you this morning, the whole system of jurisprudence in this country would fail if a witness that is called into court could say that "I don't want to tell what I know, even what I know about an accident case. I saw an accident happen, but it happened to be a friend of mine and I don't want to involve him, and I don't want to tell, therefore, whose fault it was."

If we followed your reasoning to a conclusion we would have no government at all, no judicial system.

I am done preaching.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I have a direction to the witness to answer the question that I asked her, which was whether or not she knew Dr. Sol Londe between 1944 and 1947?

Mr. MOULDER. I seem to recall that we did inform the witness that the committee did not accept her reply. But, if not, why then, you are so now advised and requested and directed to answer that question.

Mrs. KLING. Well, I appreciate Mr. Scherer's position, but on the basis that there is still an open question that may come before the Supreme Court soon—whether the naming of names is essential to the development of legislation—I decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Kling, we were speaking of Communist Party work in mass organizations, and you advised us of the interest of the Communist Party in mass organizations.

The work that the Communists were directed to do in mass organizations was for the purpose of promoting and disseminating Communist propaganda; was it not?

Mrs. KLING. Yes; I suppose that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in order to more effectively have a medium in which to propagate its principles and its views and its lines the

Communist Party would, on occasions, organize groups made up of some members of the Communist Party and others who were non-Communist Party members. That is true; is it not?

Mrs. KLING. Yes; I think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Civil Rights Congress was one of those groups; was it not?

Mrs. KLING. I don't know, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you active in the Civil Rights Congress?

Mrs. KLING. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were members of the Communist Party directed to take part in the work of the Civil Rights Congress?

Mrs. KLING. I honestly don't know, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What mass organizations did you take part in, if any? Or was your time fully consumed in the office work of the Communist Party?

Mrs. KLING. There was plenty to do. Yes; I would say I was active in the Communist Party itself.

Mr. TAVENNER. These mass organizations were also used by the Communist Party to raise funds in order to defray expenses of the diffusion of the propaganda, dissemination of the propaganda. Isn't that correct?

Mrs. KLING. Well, when I was working for the Communist Party I don't recall any money coming straight from any mass organization to the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. But money was raised for the purpose of disseminating the propaganda that the Communist Party was interested in handling through the particular mass organizations; wasn't it?

Mrs. KLING. Would you give me an example so I could—a hypothetical example.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, this is one:

We understand that a defense committee was organized here in the city of St. Louis for the purpose of raising funds to defray the expenses of the trial of those who were being tried under the Smith Act, and for propaganda purposes.

I said and for propaganda purposes.

In other words, to attempt to educate the public to things that the Communist Party was interested in demonstrating. That is the type of thing I mean.

I could give you a number of illustrations, but I think that makes the point clear.

Mrs. KLING. Well, if you mean that Communists worked in other organizations that were not the Communist Party, and that they attempted to convince other people that what they were doing was the thing to do, and to get them to believe what they believed, yes; that is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. And to raise money to propagate it?

Mrs. KLING. Well, like I said, as far as I know, no money ever came from any other organization to the Communist Party, and I can't say about this committee you are talking about. I don't know about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. We heard considerable evidence in Los Angeles within the past 30 days, and from Capt. Nikolai Khokhlov, an officer of the Soviet Intelligence, who said that large sums of money were sent by the Soviet Union to the various Communist parties of the

world. He spoke of the Communist parties on the continent of Europe, and I asked him specifically about the sending of money to the United States for the carrying on of the work of the Communist Party here.

I have no information at all that that money came down to lower levels of the Communist Party such as a district. But were you ever aware of such a thing occurring?

Mrs. KLING. No, sir; I wasn't. And I believe that my wages were somewhere between \$20 and \$25 a week. And I never saw any large sums of money.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking about large sums of money paid to you.

But was money brought into this district to propagate the objectives of the Communist Party from the national headquarters in New York?

Mrs. KLING. From the national headquarters in New York?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. KLING. Which was the American headquarters?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; of the Communist Party of the United States.

Mrs. KLING. Did they ever send money into this district?

Yes; I believe that they did.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that money used for?

Mrs. KLING. For literature, and maybe it was general operating expenses; you know, paying office and paper and things like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. And salaries?

Mr. KLING. I don't remember. I honestly don't remember where the—how the money was broken down. I never saw any budget of how, of where what money came from and to whom. Whether the salary money came from outside of St. Louis or not, the money—

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that money sent by check?

Mrs. KLING. I don't know. It may have been a money order, but I honestly don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom was the money sent?

Mrs. KLING. I don't remember that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it come regularly month by month?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. KLING. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever learn the source of those funds, as to where the national organization got money with which to run the district organizations?

Mrs. KLING. Well, I would assume——

I had assumed at the time that the national office got it from contributions of members, sale of literature, and I don't know what other sources.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not there was a State law in Missouri during the time of the operation of the mass organizations, when you were a member, which required the licensing of an organization for the raising of funds by public subscription?

Mrs. KLING. No; I don't know that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. There are some States in which there are laws requiring organizations to procure licenses, such as when a cause party is held for the benefit of the Daily Worker, that a license be procured for that purpose.

You are not aware of any such law in existence in Missouri while you were connected with the district office, are you?

Mrs. KLING. No; I wasn't aware of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a matter that the committee is giving some consideration to.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., withdrew from the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You as an intellectual have been trained in the Communist Party. You are no doubt familiar with the Communist Party history. I want to ask you if you are familiar with the activities of the Trade Union Unity League which, of course, was prior to your membership in the Communist Party but it was very active a short period before you came in.

Mrs. KLING. Yes; that name is familiar, but I really don't know anything about it.

Was that during the depression?

Mr. TAVENNER. The Trade Union Unity League was organized in Cleveland August 31, 1929, and was an American section of the Red International of Labor Unions.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Many of the labor unions at that time and for quite a period afterward were affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League. It was succeeded by the World Federation of Trade Unions, with its headquarters in Prague.

The American Federation of Labor refused to join the WFTU. The CIO, for purposes of its own, did affiliate with it and tried to save it from Communist influence, and, upon failing, withdrew from it.

But the World Federation of Trade Unions, with its headquarters in Prague, continues until this day, and this committee is studying the problem of circulating its official bulletin to labor unions and wherever they think the Communist Party could gain anything by circulating it.

I want to know if during your period of membership, from 1944 to 1947, the Communist Party here was active in any way in handling among labor unions this official publication of that organization published in Prague.

Mrs. KLING. Not to my recollection, no.

I thought that that had gone out of business in the 1930's.

Mr. TAVENNER. As an organization in this country it did because the American Federation of Labor and the CIO wouldn't stand for it. But it still surreptitiously is circulating its propaganda of a very harmful nature among labor unions in this country. And the question has arisen, and there has been considerable study given to the question, of whether or not there can be a legal answer to the situation of stopping the delivery of it through the mails when it originates from a foreign country.

Mrs. KLING. Well, as far as I know, Mr. Tavenner, I have never seen it.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should have another recess.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I am about through, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, do you want to continue?

Mrs. KLING. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I think she would like to go on.

Mrs. KLING. I would like to get home to my little boy.

Mr. TAVENNER. You may go right now as far as I am concerned.

I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mrs. KLING. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hall.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. HALL. I do.

TESTIMONY OF GILBERT HAROLD HALL

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. HALL. Harold Hall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that your full name?

Mr. HALL. Gilbert Harold Hall.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. I desire to inform you that it is the practice of the committee to permit a witness to have counsel with him, or to consult counsel at any time he may desire during the course of his interrogation.

Mr. HALL. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hall?

Mr. HALL. I was born in St. Louis here in 1919.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HALL. St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident in St. Louis?

Mr. HALL. I have always had a home in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has always been your home?

Mr. HALL. It has always been my home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you accepted employment in areas away from St. Louis for any period, as much as a month?

Mr. HALL. Well, I don't know the answer to your question. During the war I was a merchant seaman.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you join the Merchant Marine?

Mr. HALL. I think it was from about June 1943, to December 1945, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your return from that service in 1945, how were you employed?

Mr. HALL. I would decline to answer that under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. I did not understand.

Mr. HALL. I decline to answer the question under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hall, the committee's investigation discloses that on August 11, 1950, you applied for a United States passport under the name of Gilbert Harold Hall, and at that time you stated in the application that you intended to travel in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, and Poland as a tourist.

Did you file such an application with the State Department?

Mr. HALL. I would decline to answer that under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was a passport issued to you in 1950?

Mr. HALL. I also decline to answer that under the previously stated reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions in Warsaw in September 1950?

Mr. HALL. I decline to answer that under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you referring to Warsaw, Poland?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. We have a Warsaw in Benton County, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of a trade union in 1950?

Mr. HALL. I decline to answer that under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to take the position that membership in a trade union might tend to incriminate you?

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. HALL. I don't know the legal language.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that fair to your union? If we don't know the union with which you were connected, those who are in it know whether you were or not. Isn't this a very unjust position to take, that you will not admit membership in it because to do so might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. HALL. I will reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment not to answer the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there anything of an illegal or criminal nature about the trade union of which you were a member?

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Actually there wasn't, was there?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. However, you did represent a trade union abroad, did you not?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that question under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has had access to an English language information bulletin published by the Polish Press Agency. The number of the information bulletin is 108, and the date is September 21, 1950. In that bulletin reference is made to an American named Gilbert Hall as a person who attended the September 1950, session of the World Federation of Trade Unions in Warsaw, Poland, as a representative of the railroad workers of the United States.

The bulletin proceeds to give a summary of Mr. Hall's remarks at the meeting, and I want to read that to you and ask you whether you were correctly quoted:

Gilbert Hall, representative of the U. S. A. Railwaymen, spoke of the existing contrast between the peaceful desires of the American working masses and the criminal plans of the genocidal producers of atomic bombs—the Wall Street imperialists. The speaker said that since 1940, owing to unemployment, his trade union has lost one third of its members. The American troops in Korea are recruited either from unemployed workers or from those who are threatened with unemployment. Speaking on the campaign in defense of peace, Hall said that notwithstanding police repressions, 2 million persons in the United States have signed the Stockholm appeal.

Were you correctly quoted as having made those statements in an address?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did an agent of the State Department call upon you on your return to require you to surrender your passport, and you refused to do so?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer under the previously stated reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you not fail to advise the State Department of the real purpose of your trip to Europe, by stating that you were going there as a tourist when actually you intended, you expected to attend the meeting of the World Federation of Trade Unions?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you an article appearing in the New World Review, April 1951; it is entitled "American Railroader in Europe" by Amy Schechter. I will ask you to examine it, please, and state whether or not you gave the interview which is reported there.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document for identification only, Mr. Chairman, and ask that it be marked "Hall Exhibit No. 1" for retention in the files of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked "Hall Exhibit No. 1" and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever write an article for the March of Labor?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee made an investigation of the March of Labor, and has issued a report describing its Communist character. In this issue of the March of Labor bearing date of March 1951, I see an article entitled—

U. S. Rail Worker Sees Europe. St. Louis Engineer Attends International Labor Transport Meeting and Finds a Warm Spirit of Fraternity and Solidarity and a Deep Yearning for Peace. By G. Harold Hall.

Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not you are the author of that article?

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that also under the previously stated grounds, the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document for identification purposes only, ask that it be marked "Hall Exhibit No. 2" for retention in the committee files.

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked "Hall Exhibit No. 2" for identification and filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hall, did you attend a meeting in St. Louis of the Communist Party which was addressed by Mr. Otto Wangerin, a member of the railroad unit of the Communist Party on a national level, or possibly, a member of the Communist Railroad Commission?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that question on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not information was given to the local members of the Communist Party that if the Communist revolution in this country was to succeed it would be necessary to control the railroads as the capitalist system was dependent upon transportation?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member of the railroad group of the Communist Party in St. Louis; were you not?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that on the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not a member of the railroad group at this time; are you?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that also.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you are an officer of the Communist Party on a high level of the district in the Communist Party, of which Missouri is now a part?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the State board, Missouri State Board of the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. HALL. I decline to answer that also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not there is in the city of St. Louis an organized group at this time of the Communist Party within the field of railroading?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you succeed Ralph Shaw as district organizer of the Communist Party for St. Louis?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you district organizer now?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that also.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have learned a great deal about the activities of the Communist Party in this area operating within mass organizations.

Were you assigned by the Communist Party to active participation in a mass organization known as the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. HALL. I will decline to answer that on the basis of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Richard Stanford;

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. STANFORD. I do.

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD STANFORD

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. STANFORD. Richard L. Stanford.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stanford, you have the right to have counsel with you if you desire, or to confer with counsel at any time during the interrogation should you find it advisable.

When and where were you born?

Mr. STANFORD. Mississippi, May 9, 1905.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in St. Louis?

Mr. STANFORD. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

Mr. STANFORD. Since 1922.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, please, what your employment has been since 1945 or how you were employed in 1945?

Mr. STANFORD. Well, I was on the sicklist ever since the war.

Mr. TAVENNER. You haven't done any work since you have been in the Army?

Mr. STANFORD. Yes; I ain't been in the Army. I ain't been able to go.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed in 1945?

Mr. STANFORD. 1945 I was employed at Mississippi Valley Produce Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you located then?

Mr. STANFORD. Then?

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living then?

Mr. STANFORD. Living in Carr Square Village.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what State?

Mr. STANFORD. Here in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. STANFORD. I ain't had no other next employment.

You mean before then?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's go back. Yes, before then.

Mr. STANFORD. The last regular job I had was with Terminal Railroad.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you have that?

Mr. STANFORD. From 1923 up until the depression when I was cut off.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you quit working there?

Mr. STANFORD. For the terminal?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. STANFORD. I didn't quit. The depression come and I was cut off.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you cut off?

Mr. STANFORD. Along about 1932, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received evidence here from Mr. Schoemehl that you were the organizer of the cell of the Communist Party, a group in the Communist Party in 1951. Is that right?

Mr. STANFORD. I don't remember. I have been sick all that time. I don't remember—done nothing—all that. I don't know. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it that you do not know or you just do not want to answer that?

Mr. STANFORD. I decline to answer that because I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Because you don't know?

Mr. STANFORD. I decline to answer that because of the constitutional right of the fifth amendment. I don't know as far as enough to get into that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STANFORD. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder and Frazier.)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

The next witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Romey Hudson.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. HUDSON. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ROMEY HUDSON, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, R. L. WITHERSPOON

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mr. HUDSON. Romey Hudson.

Mr. TAVENNER. R-o-m-e-y?

Mr. HUDSON. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. H-u-d-s-o-n?

Mr. HUDSON. Right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record.

Mr. WITHERSPOON. R. L. Witherspoon of the Missouri bar.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hudson?

Mr. HUDSON. June 3, 1886, West Point, Miss.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HUDSON. 4161 St. Louis, St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

Mr. HUDSON. 50 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you have been employed since 1945.

Mr. HUDSON. I worked at the Principia School 33 years, and I was retired June 25, 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Schoemehl, Joseph John Schoemehl?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HUDSON. I will not answer that question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HUDSON. I decline to answer that question. It tends—It might incriminate me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schoemehl testified before this committee in executive session and described the incident which terminated his membership in the Communist Party. He told the committee that he was tried by three persons who constituted the review commission of the Communist Party here in St. Louis. And, although they did not render a decision in the matter, they questioned his loyalty to the Communist Party. They suspected that he was giving information to persons that the Communist Party thought were not entitled to it, and the result was that that was the end of his work in the Communist Party.

He testified that—

I think I will read that part of his testimony to you.

Helen Musiel phoned me. And Jim Forrest, Romey Hudson and Helen Musiel were the ones who questioned me. Ray Koch had been the head of the review commission up to the last that I heard. But he was in Chicago then and had been transferred to Chicago, or at least had gone to Chicago. And after the questions and up to almost the very last minute nothing was said about this being a review commission. But then after these notes had been brought out—

And there he was referring to notes that he took in a Communist Party meeting which some members of the Communist Party observed him take—

then Jim Forrest advised me that this was a session of the review commission and they would render their decision.

Do you recall sitting on a review commission which tried Mr. Schoemehl along with Helen Musiel and Jim Forrest?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. HUDSON. I assert the same privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member of the review commission of the Communist Party in 1949 along with Helen Musiel and Jim Forrest, were you not?

Mr. HUDSON. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where Helen Musiel lives now?

Mr. HUDSON. I assert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Jim Forrest one of those who was tried and convicted under the Smith Act in 1954?

Mr. HUDSON. For the same reason I assert it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HUDSON. For the same reason I take the privilege of the fifth amendment, and refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell this committee the names of those who were members of the railroad unit of the Communist Party?

Mr. HUDSON. For the same reason I decline to answer such a question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time since 1945?

Mr. HUDSON. I reassert the same privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

The committee regrets to announce that it will be necessary for the members of the committee to be present in Washington, D. C., to vote upon a very important pending bill.

Therefore, we will be compelled to recess until Friday morning at 9:30 a. m., and other witnesses who have been subpoenaed to attend on this day or on tomorrow, Thursday, or Friday, are hereby notified and directed to appear Friday morning at 9:30 o'clock in the morning.

The committee will stand in recess until 9:30 a. m., Friday morning. (Whereupon, at 4:40 p. m., Wednesday, June 6, the subcommittee was recessed, to be reconvened at 9:30 a. m., Friday, June 8, 1956, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 3

SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
St. Louis, Mo.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to call, in room 1100, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri, and Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

Mr. MOULDER. Have the record show that this subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of James E. Frazier, Jr., Gordon H. Scherer, and myself, Morgan M. Moulder, as chairman, acting pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601 of the Congress of the United States, has been appointed by the chairman of the full committee, there being now present Mr. Scherer and myself constituting a quorum.

The committee will come to order and proceed with the hearing of the witnesses. This subcommittee met and decided to hear the following named witnesses in executive session: Joseph Schoemehl, Loyal Hammack, and George V. L. Hardy.

Will you be sworn, Mr. Schoemehl?

Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH JOHN SCHOEMEHL

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please, sir?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Joseph John Schoemehl.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your age, Mr. Schoemehl?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Seventy-three.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in St. Louis?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I do.

¹ Executive testimony ordered released by the committee August 24, 1956.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly what your educational training has been, that is your formal educational training?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Formal education, I just about finished the seventh grade.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your principal employment since 1932?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I was in the decorating business in 1932. And during the war years I was a guard at the ordnance depot at the motor pool. And then from about—well, for 5 years I was at Famous-Barr, Spring Avenue warehouse, night watchman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schoemehl, have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I joined the party in 1932, late fall, and was an active member until about 1938 the spring of 1938, when I had a paralytic stroke and was out of commission for a while, but maintained contact at all times with the party members. And then I reentered the party in about 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the party after that?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I was never expelled, although I was called before the review commission. But there was never a verdict rendered as to expulsion or anything else. I never heard any more about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you called before the review commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. About in 1950 or 1951. I am not sure of the year at this moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend Communist Party meetings after that date?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you were approached at any time during your Communist Party membership by representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purpose of obtaining your assistance in advising the Government as to the activities of the Communist Party in this area?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was in about 1943. It was then that I rejoined the party. Well, it was at that time the Communist Political Association and I rejoined the CPA at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you have stated it was in 1943 that the Federal Bureau of Investigation contacted you?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you secure readmission into the Communist Party immediately or did some time elapse after 1943 before you became an actual member again?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Some time elapsed after that because I had to have someone approach me to get me back into it. I had to reestablish contacts that I had with different members in order to get them into the notion to ask me to come back into the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. According to your best recollection, how long was it after 1943 before you became actually and actively affiliated with the Communist Party again?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was when the Communist Political Association changed over from the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean when did you become actively affiliated with the Communist Political Association after having been approached by the FBI?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That was probably in 1944. It was some time after I had been contacted by the Bureau.

Mr. TAVENNER. From 1944 until 1950 did you advise the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the knowledge you obtained regarding Communist Party activities in this area?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee briefly the circumstances under which you became a member of the Communist Party in 1932?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I was at that time connected with a man that—well, he did all sorts of different investigative work, just a business associate, really. No contact with that at all at that time. But he asked me whether I thought I could get into the Communist Party, that he was interested and several businessmen, local businessmen here, lawyers, and so on, would like to know what was going on in there. And I told him that I would try.

And pursuant to that I went over to the Bar Branch Library where there was a meeting being held of the International Labor Defense. And I joined the International Labor Defense and became active within the affairs there. They were defending the cases of those arrested in the July 11 city hall riots in 1932. And through that I became active in that capacity attending the trials and was invited to join the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then from the very inception of your membership in the Communist Party you were acting in an undercover capacity, and you did not become a member because of any ideological beliefs on your part?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. No. I was just strictly there to report on the activities.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you first became a member of the Communist Party what was the chief activity of the Communists, and their principal objective in this area?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At the time practically the sole objective was to get relief for the people who were in need, in the way of food, shelter, clothing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that work done by the Communist Party utilized for the purpose of recruiting new members into the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Whenever they found someone that was really active and seemed to be sincere they got them into the party. If they were working in any of the other organizations, you know, that is with the Unemployed Council, the International Labor Defense, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights and the Workers' Ex-Servicemen's League and a number of groups of that sort that they set up—anyone that was active in that line that they thought they might get into the party, they would recruit into the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party control the activities of those organizations to which you referred?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They did. They set up the leadership of it in all cases.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understood you to say that you became inactive in 1938 due to an illness.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then it was in 1943 when you were requested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to again become active in the Communist Party, if you could.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you became active in the Communist Party as you have described, were you assigned to any particular group of the Communist Party, or cell of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. At that time they had clubs. I was assigned to the Roosevelt Club on the South Side.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain affiliated with that particular club of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Until the Communist Party was reconstituted, and then I was assigned to work with the South Side, one of the groups on the South Side. They still called them clubs at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any course of training prescribed about the time of the reconstitution of the Communist Party designed to indoctrinate, or more fully indoctrinate the Communist Party members in Marxist ideology?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. There was. There was a Basic Training Institute that was organized and I was secretary of it. And the object was to take these new members that were in the Communist Political Association who had no political training whatever—in fact, the majority of them were in that category, because during the thirties they hadn't done any ideological work at all excepting just the work they were doing in the way of relief. That was their main object during that period. And while there had been pamphlets sold at all times, there was no real studying periods or anything. And this Basic Training Institute was organized to indoctrinate the members, teach them what communism really means.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date of the organization of that Basic Training Institute? That is, about what year was it?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was along about in 1946 or 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many members of the Communist Party at that time, as far as you know, attended that institute?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, about 50 would be in attendance at most of the sessions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were the sessions held?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At 1041a North Grand Avenue, in the Communist Party headquarters.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they day or night sessions?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well they were mostly night sessions, although there were some day sessions held also on Sundays.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over how long a period of time did this institute hold its sessions?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. For a couple or 3 weeks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how this course of instruction was conducted?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, there were certain books of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, that were taken, you know, and parts were read there. And, of course, the students were required to memorize, like any other class would be, to see if they understood what the purpose was.

Mr. MOULDER. Would they have discussions?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes; there were discussions, question-and-answer periods.

Mr. MOULDER. Would they be sometimes referred to as discussion groups?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They would be separate groups. Separate panels would be organized to discuss a certain subject.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was the instruction directed?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. The lecturer, whoever the speaker was at that occasion, would ask questions of the group, and would have them ask questions in order to clarify points that they didn't understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. There were instructors, then, as I understand it?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes; there were instructors.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us who the instructors were, or at least name all that you can now recall?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Annie Yasgur was one of them. She was instructing the group that I was in. And different lecturers were Ralph Shaw—

Mr. TAVENNER. In giving us the names of these individuals, will you give what descriptive information you can regarding them; that is, whether they held any positions in the Communist Party, or any other information that you can recall which would more fully identify them?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Ralph Shaw. He was district organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. What would the district be? What area would the district include?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That was district 21.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know what territory that comprised?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That covered the surrounding territory here in Missouri and part of Illinois. And as far as I know, that was about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether Arkansas was also included in the district at one time?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At one time it was in. But whether it was at that particular time or not, they fluctuated and changed from time to time. Part of the time we were under the jurisdiction of Chicago, a subdistrict of Chicago.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated, Mr. Shaw, was district organizer of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

And his wife. I can't recall her first name right now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sarah?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Sarah was one of the instructors.

Ray Koch.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that last name?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Koch. K-o-c-h.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. K-o-c-h. Bob Manewitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Koch and Manewitz hold any positions in the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They were in the top brackets. They held various positions. It was rather loosely arranged. They would function as one of the top functionaries and then it would be something else again. There were no regular elections or anything of that kind that you could

really say that any individual outside of the district organizer was a certain official.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Manewitz one of the defendants convicted in the Smith Act case in 1954?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, he was.

Al Murphy—he was in the leadership of the Negro sections.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he also one of the defendants convicted in the Smith Act case?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. He was also one of the defendants.

At the time of that school, though, I think Ralph Shaw was not the district organizer here. It was Jim Forrest.

Mr. TAVENNER. James Forrest was also one of the defendants?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was one of the defendants.

Mr. TAVENNER. And convicted in the Smith Act trials?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. And convicted. And so was his wife. She also took a prominent part in the organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall her name?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Dorothy.

Douglas MacLeod lectured at one of those affairs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is he an attorney here in the city of St. Louis?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He is an attorney, yes, sir.

Then there were Clara Mae Perkins, and her husband——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Haven Perkins.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Haven. They also lectured at this Basic Training Institute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Miss Helen Musiel?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Helen Musiel also spoke at it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Anne (Ann) Yasgur?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I already mentioned Anne (Ann) Yasgur.

I was trying to think of some of the others, now. I hadn't thought of Haven and Mac Perkins before, either.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What about Marcella Oser?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes; Marcella Oser.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And Nathan?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. And Nathan Oser. They also lectured on some subjects.

I think that is about all that I can remember of them now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this institute or school for members of the Communist Party only?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were persons not members of the Communist Party permitted to attend this institute?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. To the best of my knowledge there was none but party members permitted, because I knew practically all of those and all of the students, and I had met all of them at party meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were these persons who acted in a teaching capacity as instructors or lecturers members of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. All of them were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there included in the instruction given to this group a Communist plan or program to set up an independent unit of government in an area in the south of this country?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, Murphy at all times—I don't know whether it was particularly in this institute or not—but at all times there was one point that he would stress, and that was that the black

belt, so-called, of the South should be a separate entity and have its own government. In other words, self-determination.

Mr. MOULDER. Was he colored?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was colored.

Mr. MOULDER. This is off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of the conduct of this school, did speakers or lecturers from New York or other areas of the United States take part in the meetings?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. None that I recall. Usually when outside visitors came they had special meetings for them. But there was none at the school here that I recall offhand, unless we would consider Shaw who had formerly been district organizer and happened to be here for one of these lectures.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schoemehl, you stated that Clara Mae Perkins and Haven Perkins assisted in the conduct of this school. Can you at this point tell us of any other Communist Party activity in which they engaged?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. No; I can't, because many of those things were kept more or less separate. Unless you happened to be working with them you didn't know what work they were doing. They would come in with a report on certain matters, but I don't know just exactly what they were detailed to do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend Communist Party meetings with Clara Mae Perkins and Haven Perkins subsequent to the conduct of this school?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I can't remember any special time or meeting because several of those cases are pretty far back. And you would meet them at meetings, but of course, outside of my reports, I wouldn't remember. That is, to make a positive statement as to a time and place I couldn't do it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have occasion, after the conduct of this school, to attend Communist Party meetings with Douglas MacLeod?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I can't remember any certain specific time, because I met them—It was just the usual thing, you know. There was nothing unusual about meeting them. And at this time it wouldn't register with me when I saw them after that because I met them from time to time on the streets and otherwise. It would be hard for me to say because it has been over 5 years since I was in much of the activities here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Douglas MacLeod attend any meetings of the Communist Party at which you were present?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At general membership meetings, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Were those general membership meetings closed Communist Party meetings?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They were closed meetings, Communist Party meetings. Only Communist Party members were supposed to be there.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is that only Communist Party members were permitted to be at those meetings.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Was much emphasis placed on this creation of a separate state or separate government for the Negroes in the South?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was always mentioned that it should be done. But there was never anything said about how it was going to be done and who was going to do it.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever see any of the maps or diagrams that had been prepared by the Communist Party showing just where this colored state was to be set up in the South?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. No, sir; I did not. They merely mentioned the counties and the States in which they were located, but I never did see a map or any diagram of it.

Mr. SCHERER. But they did go so far as to mention the counties and the States in which this separate state was to be set up?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. And those States were in the South, were they not?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They were in the South. They mentioned the population by white and colored showing the predominance of the Negro in the area.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean in those areas you were to have a colored state?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Did they gain many converts to that idea of a separate colored state among the colored members of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, they all seemed to be in favor of it, but I don't know that they ever made any real point about doing anything about it.

Mr. SCHERER. Were there some Negroes in the Communist Party that objected to this idea of the creation of a separate state for colored?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I never heard of one of them hardy enough to try it, to object to it. And even outside of that, I never heard any discussions of any kind that they disapproved of it.

Mr. SCHERER. There were colored members of the Communist Party in your groups, were there not?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. In fact, I was sent to the North Side because they had a group up there composed entirely of Negroes, and they couldn't get any white comrades up there. They couldn't make any Communists out of any of the white folks in that neighborhood. So I was one of those assigned to become a member of that group. They had a Jim Crow group up there, and of course that wouldn't do among Communists. They always preserved the fact of the party. There had to be colored and white.

Mr. SCHERER. But actually, integration didn't even work among the rank and file of the Communist Party in this particular area, then?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Not in certain sections of it.

Mr. SCHERER. There was forced integration then.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. By the leadership of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, but it was in reverse here. They had to force the white folks into the Negro units.

Mr. SCHERER. Did the colored object to the white folks?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Oh, no, they didn't object.

Mr. SCHERER. It was the fact that the white Communists didn't want to associate with the colored Communists, is that it?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, there weren't any living in that particular locality. And I moved across the demarcation line, Market Street, between north and south St. Louis so I happened to be on the North Side then and I was assigned to join that unit up there. I was assigned to that unit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Who headed that unit, Mr. Schoemehl?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Richard Stanford.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Approximately what year was that?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That was along about in 1947 or 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that Douglas MacLeod attended general membership meetings of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us over what period of time, as nearly as you can recall, that he attended such meetings?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Up until about 1950. After that I did not see him very often at party meetings.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the time you left the party, or were expelled from the party, or stopped your activities in the party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Up to that time I saw him at those meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Up to 1950?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That is, not at every meeting, of course, but whenever there was one of those meetings he would be apt to be there.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you seen him since?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I meet him on the street quite often.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know whether he is a member of the Communist Party today?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That, I couldn't say.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you had any conversations with him since 1950 with reference to membership in the party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. No, I have not, because I was under a cloud at that time. And of course they avoided meeting me or talking to me, just to say "Howdy" as they passed and that was all.

Mr. SCHERER. You came under a cloud because they suspected you were an agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Is that the reason?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Did your hearing before the review commission result by reason of the fact that you were suspected of being an agent for the FBI?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, they didn't know whom I was reporting to but they suspected that I was giving information to someone. They didn't charge me with it, exactly.

Mr. SCHERER. But they did hold a hearing?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It hinged on some notes I had made at a general membership meeting. And it was customary at that time because right in front of me a girl sat there and she was taking down practically everything in shorthand. But in my notes I had—Ray Koch made a statement and quoted a certain publication—it was a book. He mentioned the author. And I questioned the correctness of that statement, that is in my mind, and made a note of it. And on that they

hinged the point that I must be giving information to someone because otherwise I wouldn't have made a note about that particular item.

I also mentioned on that note "The Big I had made a certain report." And Helen Musiel wanted to know who the Big I was. Well I refused to tell her.

Mr. SCHERER. Who was the Big I, if you recall?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I can't remember the woman's name. She was active in, I think it was, the Longshoremen's Union. That is she was working in that office.

Mr. SCHERER. She was a Communist?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. She was.

Mr. SCHERER. She made what kind of a report?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. She was just telling how—let's see, how do they state that now?—self criticism, which of course could be taken as an individual or as the party activities. And she was criticizing the party by telling what a good worker she was. She didn't criticize the party exactly, but she was referring to her work for the party. And that was why I called her the Big I. She was giving herself a pat on the back.

Mr. TAVENNER. Having gone this far with matters leading up to your being called before the review commission, will you continue, please, and tell the committee just what occurred?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. About in December, as a rule, every year they would have a, well, sort of a questionnaire. You would be asked to tell about where you worked and how much you made, because you are supposed to pay 10 percent of your salary as dues, and questions of that sort. What work you had done for the party during the past year. I forget what they called that. At any rate, on that was based whether or not you would receive your party card for the following year. But sometimes they would call you in any time during the year. And they called me in along about in May and asked me those questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you recall who called you in?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Helen Musiel phoned me. And Jim Forrest, Romey Hudson and Helen Musiel were the ones who questioned me. Ray Koch had been the head of the review commission up to the last that I heard. But he was in Chicago then and had been transferred to Chicago, or at least had gone to Chicago. And after the questions and up to almost the very last minute nothing was said about this being a review commission. But then after these notes had been brought out, then Jim Forrest advised me that this was a session of the review commission and they would render their decision.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you give us more identification of Helen Musiel, her occupation and so forth?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. She was a packinghouse worker. And she was very active in the party activities when I first joined the Communist Political Association. She was more or less in charge, she and Sarah Kling—Sarah Shaw, pardon me.

Mr. MOULDER. Was Helen Musiel married or was that her maiden name?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. She was single.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know where she came from?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I think she was a local, born in St. Louis here, to the best of my knowledge. I am not positive of that, but her family were here. She had a sister here who was married.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you tell us the family name?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I don't know what her name was. Just Musiel was the only one that I knew as her family name.

Mr. SCHERER. Was the review commission a sort of a disciplinary board?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any decision from that review commission transmitted to you?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was not. I wrote Forrest two letters, and one to Helen Musiel, but I never received a reply to any of them.

Mr. SCHERER. Letters asking what the decision had been?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. What the decision was. I wanted to know what the decision was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you continue in your Communist Party activities after that time?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did not, because I had been sort of isolated for about 2 years before this. They had evidently become suspicious and assigned me to a unit that was inactive. In fact the only meetings I—I would attend meetings there but it was merely Richard Stanford and his wife and I. None of the other members of that unit attended meetings. I didn't even know who the other members were supposed to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like now to go back to an earlier period in your membership. You have told us about the Basic Training Institute. Was there any other course of training made available to members of the Communist Party in this area?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, they had the Joseph Weydemeyer School of Social Science. But it was not confined strictly to party members.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it operated on about the same principle as the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir. They used the same textbooks that they used there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend this school?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us the year in which that occurred?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Just off hand I can't remember. There were several sessions of it, that is in several years there. About two and a half years that I remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the instructors, as far as you can now recall?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. There was Jim Forrest, Dorothy Forrest, Ray Koch—Nathan Oser was at one of those. He was really not an instructor. He merely appeared at one of the sessions—Al Murphy, Bob Manewitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are those all that you can now recall?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Those are the only ones I can recall offhand.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were the sessions of the classes held of the Weydemeyer School?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At the Communist Party headquarters, 1041a North Grand Avenue. You see, each of these instructors had a separate class, and I did not attend all of the classes. That is I picked out certain classes that I attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe each of those named by you as instructors in the Joseph Weydemeyer School were also instructors in the Basic Training Institute?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Most of them were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any instructor in the Joseph Weydemeyer school, as far as you can remember, not a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. To the best of my knowledge there was none but Communist Party members that I know, off hand.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the main purpose of this school?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was similar to the Basic Training Institute in that it took certain subjects that were gone into in more detail than they had been in the institute. It was a sort of higher group about the same as we would say a high school after finishing grammar school.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask this: Can you recall the names of any other persons who attended that school at the same time you attended it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record just a moment.
(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MOULDER. You say you couldn't give the year, but you say the school extended over a period of 2 years or 2½ years.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Could you give us approximately the period covered by the 2½ years?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. There was a fall session and a spring session.

Mr. MOULDER. Of approximately what years?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. As nearly as I can figure it, it was along about in 1947.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is 1949, Mr. Schoemehl.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Sir?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it was around 1949.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It may have been as late as that. That is part of my trouble.

Mr. MOULDER. It was 1947, 1948, or 1949?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Somewhere along there; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schoemehl, are you acquainted with a person by the name of Dr. Sol Londe?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known by you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what do you base your statement that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. When I was the unit organizer of a unit on the South Side, Dr. Londe and the woman whom he married later were assigned to my unit to attend a couple of meetings in order to learn how to conduct a meeting of the Communist Party. This was done at the orders of the district organizer at that time. He informed me that Dr. Londe and his fiancée were going to set up a professional unit of the Communist Party, membership to be limited entirely to professional people, and that Dr. Londe was to be the unit organizer of that unit. They attended two meetings, to my knowledge—it may have been three—at which they sat in at the meetings and asked me about different matters as to how things were being conducted.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not at any time attend a meeting of the professional group?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did not. I don't know who the membership was, or whether it consisted of doctors and lawyers or other professional people. I don't know anything further about it, except that he was designated to set up such a group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Dr. Londe, while attending your meetings, indicate to you in any manner that he had been assigned for that particular type of work?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. When he came to the meeting that night he introduced himself and had credentials there from the district organizer instructing me to permit him to attend the meetings. No outsider was permitted to attend a unit meeting unless he was known as an official of the Communist Party. And that was done in order that I would permit him to sit in at the meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the year in which that occurred?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That occurred sometime prior to 1938.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was during the period of your first activity?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. My first activity, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Because I was never unit organizer in the party after I rejoined it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Back on the record just a minute.

May I ask that the investigator, Mr. George Williams, conduct the rest of the examination?

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Williams.

Mr. WILLIAMS. While you were a member of the Communist Party did you ever have occasion to know Zollie, Z-o-l-l-i-e, Carpenter as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under what circumstances did you know him to be a member?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I met him at party meetings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In what period of time was this?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Along about 1948 or 1949.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall what group or club Carpenter was assigned to?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I don't know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where were these Communist Party meetings when you met with him?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. At the party headquarters, 1041a North Grand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were closed Communist Party meetings?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They were closed party meetings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you know where Carpenter worked?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. No; I do not.

Mr. MOULDER. How many people would usually attend the Communist Party meetings at the headquarters on Grand Avenue?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. The attendance would fluctuate. But ordinarily there would be up to as many as a hundred or 125 people there. They came from all over the city.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever have occasion to meet a Mr. John Day—D-a-y?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you know Day to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What were the circumstances under which you knew Day to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was assigned at one time to work among the farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall approximately when that was?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was in that period after the party was reconstituted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After 1945?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did Day ever hold any official position with the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Outside of that about being sent out to organize the farmers, I don't remember that he had any particular title. On those things, as I mentioned before, there was no formality about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall whether or not he was ever on the State committee of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I believe he was. During that period he was on the State committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you know a Mr. Louis England, E-n-g-l-a-n-d as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How did you happen to know Mr. England?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I met him at party meetings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was he a resident of St. Louis?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was at that time. And then he moved out near Sullivan, Mo., on a farm.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever have occasion to know a Mr. Harold Hall?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir. He was a member.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What were the circumstances under which you knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I met him at several party meetings. And on one occasion a group had been called together for some special purpose—I don't remember the purpose just off hand—and he was assigned to that group also. That was party members only who were assigned to do some certain work.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall what this work was?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I don't recall offhand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the approximate period of time of that?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was in the period after 1945 there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you know what type of work Mr. Hall was engaged in?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I think he was a railroad worker.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you know a Roger Heffner, H-e-f-f-n-e-r?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you know him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you meet with Mr. Heffner in closed Communist Party meetings?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When, approximately?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. In the period after 1945.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you have occasion to meet Mr. Louis Kimmel, K-i-m-m-e-l, as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was that?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. During that period from 1945 on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you meet in closed Communist Party meetings with Mr. Kimmel?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. MOULDER. What was his business or occupation?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Sir?

Mr. MOULDER. What was his business or occupation?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I don't know. He was always with Bill Sentner. One of those convicted in the trial in 1954.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Sentner was with the United Electrical Workers?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was with the electrical workers, yes. I don't know whether Lou Kimmel was an electrical worker or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever have occasion to meet a William Massingale?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You knew him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I knew him as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In approximately what period of time?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Along in 1945 and up. I am not quite sure whether I met him before that time or not. I had heard of him, but I don't remember meeting him before then. When I was assigned to the North Side unit there, that was when I came in contact with Massingale.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was that?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That was about in 1946 or somewhere in there.

Mr. MOULDER. What did he do?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was an elevator operator at the time that I first met him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did Massingale ever run for any public office here in St. Louis?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He ran for State representative.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was he elected?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was elected in the 19th District. He served in the State Legislature during that period.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall if the Communist Party backed his campaign, or in any way planned the strategy of his campaign for public office?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. The Communist Party were full strength behind him. They threw all of their forces up into that territory to work for Massingale to elect him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To your knowledge, was he a member of the Communist Party when he was elected to the State legislature?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever have an occasion to meet Bruce Miller?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall to what group Miller was assigned in the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. He was assigned to the group on the South Side. I attended Communist Party meetings at his home.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask, how many persons attended such meetings approximately?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, generally anywhere from 5 to 10.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall any other persons who attended meetings at Miller's home?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Helen Musiel was there, and Miller's wife.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is that Laura Miller?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Laura. Just offhand I couldn't remember exactly who the others were.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To your knowledge was Bruce Miller an officer in the South Side Club of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I wouldn't know.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you know what Mr. Miller's occupation was?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Truckdriver.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever have an occasion to meet a James Moore, a colored person?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. No, not colored; white. James Moore.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are two James Moores. One is James Ted Moore, a white person.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And James Moore, a colored person.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. No; I didn't meet the colored person.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But you knew James Ted Moore?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. James Moore, the white man. James Ted Moore, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When did you know James Ted Moore to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I knew James Ted Moore about in 1935-36. In fact, it was James Ted Moore that sponsored my return to the Communist Party at the time of the Communist Political Association. (Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the room at this point.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever know a Tom Schmidt to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How recently did you know Schmidt to be a member?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. During the time that Massingale was running for office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Which would be 1946?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you meet in closed Communist Party meetings with Tom Schmidt?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes, I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was that in 1946?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Along about that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Were those meetings held at Communist Party headquarters?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. They were.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever have occasion to meet Elliott Waxman, W-a-x-m-a-n, as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under what circumstances did you meet Waxman?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I met him several times at Communist Party meetings. And he was the Daily Worker agent. He handled the subscription drives for the Daily Worker.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was the last time you met in a closed Communist Party meeting with Elliott Waxman?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, it was not exactly a closed party meeting. It was a Daily Worker drive and they were seeking subscriptions, that is, those that had expired.

Mine had expired, and I was under a cloud at the time. But I was invited to a meeting at the basement of Stanford's home on St. Louis Avenue. Stanford was not present at the meeting.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you recall the approximate time of this meeting?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I think it was about in 1952.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 1951 or 1952?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. 1951 or 1952.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was that subsequent to your meeting with the review commission?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How many persons were present at this Daily Worker drive meeting?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was 6 or 7.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Were any security measures taken at this meeting?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. There was a couple there, Herman Pearson and his wife, colored. And after the subscriptions were in, Pearson and his wife left. And after they had gone Waxman made the remark, "Well, now we can let our hair down. We don't have to be leery of anybody that is here now." But I can't remember who the other people were there besides that. Pearson was also under a cloud, apparently under suspicion.

Pearson and his wife Eula, they separated and were later divorced. Eula moved to Massillon, Ohio, and she was one of those mentioned in the trial over there.

Mr. WILLIAM. Had you ever met in closed Communist Party meetings with Waxman prior to this Daily Worker drive?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was that, approximately?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. It was several of these general membership meetings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Around 1946 and 1947?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Yes. And Waxman would be there to talk on the Daily Worker and the necessity of reading Communist literature.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe that is all we have right now.

That concludes the questions I would like to ask the witness.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Schoemehl, the committee wants to thank you for cooperating with your Government. You are to be commended for the valuable testimony you have given the committee.

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. I did the best I could under the circumstances. It comes a little bit difficult.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Schoemehl will be excused for the present.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m. Saturday, June 2, 1956, the executive session of the subcommittee was recessed to be reconvened at 3 p. m. in room 824, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representative Scherer.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1956

(Executive Session)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at 3 p. m. in room 824, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, pursuant to recess. Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and Gordon H. Scherer were present.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you swear in the witness?

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Hammack, do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HAMMACK. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LOYAL HAMMACK

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, sir?

Mr. HAMMACK. Loyal Hammack, L-o-y-a-l H-a-m-m-a-c-k.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hammack?

Mr. HAMMACK. I was born in Benton, Ill., 1914.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HAMMACK. I live at 601 Market Street, Ste. Genevieve, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of Ste. Genevieve?

Mr. HAMMACK. Fifteen years.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. HAMMACK. I was a student at Drury College, Springfield, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your major employment has been since you took up your residence in Ste. Genevieve?

Mr. HAMMACK. Railroading and train service until about 4 years ago.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time during the past 15 years?

Mr. HAMMACK. Yes, sir. I have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become a member?

Mr. HAMMACK. I think it was in 1948, but that may not be correct. It may have been from 1947. I am hazy on that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMACK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you sever your connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMACK. It was a gradual severance. And I became disassociated with them ultimately in, I think, 1951. It is hard for me to determine that except by events.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member of the Communist Party, then, approximately from 1947 to 1951?

Mr. HAMMACK. Approximately.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you became affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMACK. I received some pamphlets written by Scott Nearing called World Events and one evening when my family was gone I went to a tavern on the outskirts of Ste. Genevieve with a group of friends. And at this tavern I met a man who talked the same language that these pamphlets talked so I gave him some of them. His name was George Kimmel.

Mr. TAVENNER. K-i-m-m-e-l?

Mr. HAMMACK. K-i-m-m-e-l.

We discussed world politics in general and shortly after, I would say in the space of a month, a man drove up to my residence. I was cutting grass in the front yard. He got out of a Chevrolet coupe and came across the street to me and said, "Are you Mr. Hammack?"

And I said, "Yes, sir. What can I do for you?"

He said, "You gave some pamphlets to Mr. Kimmel. I would like to repay you in kind."

And I said, "Who are you?"

And he said, "I am Ray Koch, the secretary of the Communist Party of the State of Missouri."

I invited him into my home and we sat and talked.

At that time I was—communism was a rather obnoxious name to me. But to my way of thinking Mr. Koch talked sense. He gave me at that time a book by the Red Dean of Canterbury and we talked a brief time after that and he excused himself.

And I read some of the literature that he had given me and I had paid for. And shortly after that he came again, if I am not mistaken, in company with Mr. Kimmel this time, who did not stay at my home but went to visit friends of his who lived behind us. I think at that time I subscribed to the Worker.

Mr. MOULDER. That is the Daily Worker?

Mr. HAMMACK. No, just the Worker, the Sunday Worker. I got it once a week.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker?

Mr. HAMMACK. That is correct. It is stipulated "The Worker."

I don't know whether it was at this time or not, but I was approached on paying dues into the Communist Party, which was 75 cents a month for my income bracket. That is the way I got in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was this person to whom you gave the pamphlets, George Kimmel, employed at that time?

Mr. HAMMACK. I think that he was at that time a discharged worker of the Mississippi Lime Co. I am not quite sure whether he was employed or whether he was a discharged worker in 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what labor union had organized the Mississippi Lime Co. at that time? That is in 1947?

Mr. HAMMACK. It was an international of—I think it was the International Hod Carriers Union, if I am not mistaken, A. F. of L. at

that time. But Mr. Kimmel was a working member of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union, and endeavoring to organize the workers at the Mississippi Lime Co., if my dates are correct on that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union had organized that plant before 1947 or whether it was some time after 1947?

Mr. HAMMACK. It was, I think, after 1947. It was in the process of being organized when I talked to Mr. Kimmel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what position Mr. Kimmel held within the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union?

Mr. HAMMACK. At that time it was probably—I don't know, but probably an unofficial organizer. He was later elected president of the local union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what local that was?

Mr. HAMMACK. I don't know the number of it, no, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what plants it had organized at the time that Mr. Kimmel was president of it?

Mr. HAMMACK. The vertical plant and the rotary plants.

Mr. MOULDER. Where located?

Mr. HAMMACK. In Ste. Genevieve, Mo.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know where Mr. Kimmel was from?

Mr. HAMMACK. He is from Ste. Genevieve, and still resides there.

Mr. MOULDER. Prior to that time, do you know where he came from?

Mr. HAMMACK. He was from St. Louis originally, I understand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. When you spoke of the vertical and rotary plants, were they plants of a particular corporation?

Mr. HAMMACK. They were plants of the Mississippi Lime Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether there was an election later, at which time the Mine, Mill, and Smelter lost the bargaining rights with Mississippi Lime Co. and another union won the bargaining rights?

Mr. HAMMACK. Yes. The Gas Coke and Chemical Workers Union are now the bargaining agents.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is Mr. George Kimmel now affiliated with that union?

Mr. HAMMACK. He is no longer an employee of the Mississippi Lime Co. And I don't believe he is affiliated with the organization at all anymore.

Mr. TAVENNER. After Mine, Mill, and Smelter lost the election at Mississippi Lime Co., did Mr. George Kimmel become a member of the Gas Coke and Chemical Workers Union at the Mississippi Lime plant?

Mr. HAMMACK. I don't know. He fought them.

Mr. MOULDER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us the part George Kimmel played in your first becoming a member of the Communist Party. After becoming a member of the Communist Party did anything occur which would serve as a basis of your knowing George Kimmel was himself a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMACK. Frankly, Mr. Kimmel probably never told me in so many words that he was a Communist. I probably never told him in so many words that I was. But on several occasions I met with him and Mr. Koch, either on the street or in my home, and discussed Communist tactics. I would assume that he would have no business discussing Communist tactics and policies unless he were a Communist.

On another occasion I was supposed to pay 75 cents a month dues, which I sometimes neglected to do. That was supposed to be sent to St. Louis to Mr. Ray Koch, or the Communist Headquarters on, I think, Grand Avenue. I was delinquent 2 months' dues one time and I met Mr. Kimmel downtown, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what place?

Mr. HAMMACK. In Ste. Genevieve. And I started talking with him. We were on good terms at that time. And I mentioned in passing that I had failed to pay my dues and wondered if he was going to see Mr. Koch in the near future. And he said, yes, he was. So I gave him a dollar and a half to pay 2 months' dues in arrears.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. Did you tell Mr. Kimmel that those were Communist Party dues?

Mr. HAMMACK. Yes, sir. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

Mr. HAMMACK. In that conversation Mr. Kimmel told me that he had not paid his dues for some time but that he was in organization work for Mine, Mill, and Smelter I believe at Herculaneum, Mo., and that work done for the organization of Mine, Mill, and Smelter would serve in lieu of paying dues. Those were not his exact words, but his meaning.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, by reason of the type of work which he was doing he would not have to continue with the payment of his Communist Party dues?

Mr. HAMMACK. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a clear admission of Communist Party membership.

Mr. HAMMACK. Apparently so, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any other occurrence in which George Kimmel indicated his own membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMACK. We had bull sessions quite frequently in which he told me of Communist literature that he was reading. And we discussed various problems, local, national, even international.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. On one occasion did he introduce you to someone?

Mr. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about that.

Mr. HAMMACK. After a successful election on the part of Mine, Mill, and Smelter I met him and a group of Mine, Mill, and Smelter unionists at a tavern downtown called Toad's place. I was asked to have a drink, which I did, and George and I were talking at the bar when another gentleman walked up and Mr. Kimmel introduced him to me as Mr. Linus Wampler. And he said, "It's O. K., Linus, you can talk to him. He is one of us."

Mr. TAVENNER. You were not a member of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union?

Mr. HAMMACK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMACK. Yes, sir. I assumed, of course, that he was referring to communism when he mentioned this.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time you were a member of the Communist Party was there an organized group of the Communist Party in Ste. Genevieve?

Mr. HAMMACK. I think not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean that you were not assigned to any particular cell?

Mr. HAMMACK. That is correct. I was not assigned to any cell.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your reason for terminating your affiliation with the Communist Party?

Mr. HAMMACK. There was opposition on the part of my family, after they knew I was associated with the Communist Party, to get me to change my ways of thinking. Almost from the beginning my wife was scandalized and abhorred by the idea. My mother and father talked to me and pleaded with me not to have anything to do with it. And I suppose I would have given up a long time ago except I was stubborn. It almost broke up my home. And I think that I love my wife and family much more than I did the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. In addition to that, were you swayed by any of the activities and their methods of endeavoring to dominate and control, for one example, the Mine, Mill and Smelter Union?

Mr. HAMMACK. The ultimate severance from the party occurred when they actually staged a riot in Ste. Genevieve, when Mine, Mill and Smelter attempted to mob a group of opposing organizers from district 50.

Mr. MOULDER. Was that mob or action led and inspired by Communist Party leadership?

Mr. HAMMACK. I couldn't say that it was anything different than that, having witnessed it that night and seeing Mr. Kimmel in the background—although he took no active part in it himself. He used the Mine, Mill and Smelter members to actually form a goon gang who beat up men and threw rocks and molested and disturbed the peace of Ste. Genevieve.

Of course, a priest talked to me that same night. Ste. Genevieve is a very poor place to have a Communist organization with predominantly Catholics. And that swayed me some, although I am not a Catholic myself. But I think it was just being filled up to the neck with some of the tactics that they used in the town where I could actually see that they talked out of both sides of their mouths.

Mr. MOULDER. What information do you have that Kimmel was the controlling person in charge of the riot and acts of violence that you referred to?

Mr. HAMMACK. Actually, I couldn't put my finger on it. Those are things of course, that you just about have to surmise. But seeing him present at the mass meeting that was broken up would indicate to me beyond a shadow of a doubt that he was the instigator of it, having discussed with him his methods previous to that in regard to the way he handles people. He is a very intelligent, although an uneducated, man. And he is a very dedicated man to what he thinks is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon, at 3:30 p. m. Saturday, June 2, 1956, the executive session of the subcommittee was recessed to be reconvened at 4:30 p. m. in room 1100, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

(The subcommittee was reconvened at 4:30 p. m., June 2, 1956, in room 1100, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, pursuant to recess. Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and Gordon H. Scherer were present.)

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Hardy, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HARDY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE V. L. HARDY

(Executive Session)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name?

Mr. HARDY. George V. L. Hardy.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed on the 3d day of August 1950 and on the 13th day of August 1952?

Mr. HARDY. As an employment manager, Fisher Body Division, General Motors Corp., St. Louis plant.

Mr. TAVENNER. What were your duties with reference to applicants for employment?

Mr. HARDY. To supervise the applicants, follow up on any reference inquiries and also to place those desirable in jobs that they were capable of doing.

Mr. TAVENNER. A subpoena duces tecum has been issued by this committee directing the production by you of an application for employment by James H. Sage, bearing date of August 3, 1950, and another application bearing date the 13th day of August, 1952, and also all reference inquiries made by you regarding this applicant. Do you have the documents called for?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a paper bearing date of August 3, 1950, marked for identification only as Hardy Exhibit No. 1, and I ask you to examine it.

Is that the application of Mr. Sage which you produced under the subpoena?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. I offer the document and ask that it be marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. MOULDER. The document shall be marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 1" and is admitted in evidence.

(The document referred to, marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 1," was filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. This document appears to be a copy. Will you explain how it was prepared?

Mr. HARDY. When the investigator came to the plant office and on going into Mr. Sage's file, it was deemed necessary that a copy be

made of this application, and as we had a machine available, that was done.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a true and accurate copy of the original?

Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a paper bearing date August 13, 1952, marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 2" for identification only. Will you examine it and state whether or not it is the application of Mr. Sage produced by you under the subpoena?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it likewise a true and accurate copy of the original?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a reference inquiry regarding Mr. Sage bearing date October 29, 1952, marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 3" for identification only. Would you examine it and state whether it is the document which you have produced under the subpoena?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it a true and accurate copy of the original?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer both of the last mentioned documents into evidence and ask that they be marked "Hardy Exhibits Nos. 2 and 3," respectively.

Mr. MOULDER. Hardy Exhibits Nos. 2 and 3 admitted in evidence.

(The documents referred to, marked "Hardy Exhibits Nos. 2 and 3," were filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you Hardy Exhibit No. 1 and ask you whether or not that is the application for employment by James H. Sage?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. What address did James H. Sage give on his application?

Mr. HARDY. 5673a Cabanne, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know who occupied that residence at the time of the making of that application?

Mr. HARDY. It was reported in the newspaper at that time during some trials, I believe, that were going on, that was William Sentner and his wife's address also.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was William Sentner one of the Smith Act defendants convicted in the recent Smith Act trials in 1954 in St. Louis?

Mr. HARDY. I wouldn't be certain of that. I am not sure.

Mr. SCHERER. What does the staff investigation show as to whether or not William Sentner was convicted in St. Louis as the result of prosecution under the Smith Act?

Mr. TAVENNER. Examination of the record of that trial discloses that he was convicted.

Mr. SCHERER. And that the address given by this witness was Sentner's address?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not prepared to state that for the record at this moment.

Mr. SCHERER. Although I understand the witness just testified that during the Smith Act trials the address of one William Sentner was the address given on this Hardy Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. As reported by the newspapers.

Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not Sage left the employment of your company shortly after being employed in 1950?

Mr. HARDY. As a result of a model change in the early part of November 1950 all employees, with the exception of a few maintenance men and those taking inventory, were laid off subject to recall within a 2- to 3-week period. And, of course, they knew in advance that they would be coming back at that time.

However, he did not come back at that time and did return—May I refer to this?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Did return on Monday, December 11, 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was he supposed to return?

Mr. SCHERER. Approximately?

Mr. HARDY. It would have been sometime within the last week in November. I don't know the exact date.

Mr. TAVENNER. But he did not return until what date?

Mr. HARDY. Monday, December 11.

Mr. TAVENNER. What action did you take as a result of his failure to return when notified to return?

Mr. HARDY. In accordance with our contract between our corporation and the union, a man who is notified to return to work has 3 days in which to do it. And we send out a registered letter to notify them that they have a certain time to return. And, of course, when that period is over they are automatically washed off the roll.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he automatically washed off your rolls as a result of failure to appear?

Mr. HARDY. That is right, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you sent him the notice.

Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What subsequent action was taken?

Mr. HARDY. Well, as I stated, he came into the office on Monday, December 11, and requested that his release be reconsidered.

Now, in attempting to establish his whereabouts during that time he gave me a story as to where he had gone during that period. And if I may refresh myself, I will read from this.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir.

Let me ask you first, is that a statement prepared by you of the information which he gave to you at the time he returned on December 11?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir.

Mr. HARDY. He stated that he left work on November 3, 1950, and subsequently left St. Louis, driving to New York, arriving on November 10, 1950. He took a Curtiss-Reid airplane which stopped at Montreal and also Gander, Newfoundland. The plane landed in Paris. And he explained that the airline did not have a permit to land in London. So he took a local plane to London from Paris on the same day.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he state his reason for his desire to go to London?

Mr. HARDY. Yes. He gave me the information that the conference—he was supposed to go to some special conference there, but he didn't go into any further detail than that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what conference that was?

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether it was the Second World Peace Congress?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, I am quite sure that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir. If you will proceed, please.

Mr. HARDY. On November 11 he returned to Paris where he stayed until the 14th or 15th, on which date he stated he went to Brussels, Belgium, and then continued on the 15th to Prague. And he continued to Warsaw on the 17th where he said he was unable to continue by plane. He then went to a port in Poland and boarded a boat which he later identified as the *Batory*.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask you a question. Isn't that the same boat on which Eisler made his getaway?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, it is.

Mr. HARDY. This boat was due to land at some German port which he did not name. But he stated it was so heavily laden that it docked at Southampton first and then proceeded to the German port. It touched at Le Havre and then docked at New York on Friday, December 8. And he then flew by TWA airline to St. Louis on the same date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Reviewing the narrative of his account of his travels, the period from November 17 to December 8 is unaccounted for, is it not?

Mr. HARDY. Yes. He told that he went on this boat, the *Batory*, and it docked at Southampton and then proceeded to some unknown German port, it touched at Le Havre, and then finally docked at New York.

Mr. SCHERER. On what date?

Mr. HARDY. On Friday, December 8.

Mr. MOULDER. When was he in Warsaw?

Mr. TAVENNER. The 17th of November.

Mr. MOULDER. Is it shown how long he was in Warsaw?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Was anything said by Mr. Sage indicating that he traveled into the Soviet Union?

Mr. HARDY. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Sage make any statement to you about the expenses of his trip, as to how they were furnished, or by whom?

Mr. HARDY. No, he didn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time that he gave this account of his travels on December 11, did anyone accompany him to your office, as far as you can recall?

Mr. HARDY. Not so far as I remember, no. I am quite sure there was no one else.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you sent the registered letter to Mr. Sage notifying him that he should return within 3 days to work, was there a return receipt requested?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, there was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive a receipt?

Mr. HARDY. Off the record a moment.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give your answer as to what you understand?

Mr. HARDY. I have been informed by Mr. Collins that Mr. Simpson said that he had seen a copy of it, or rather the return receipt signed by William Sentner, Jr.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who is Mr. Simpson?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Simpson is the director of industrial relations for our plant.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you obtain a copy of that receipt and file it with the reporter as a part of your testimony?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, I will.

Mr. MOULDER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. When this receipt is received by the reporter, I would like it to be offered in evidence and marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 4."

Mr. MOULDER. The exhibit will be so marked and admitted in evidence.

(The document referred to was so designated as "Hardy Exhibit No. 4" to be filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. Sage present any evidence to you that would support him in his statement of travel abroad?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; in view of the fact that his travels seemed to be very unusual, there was some doubt that he had made this trip. So I requested that he bring in some evidence to support his story. And he did bring 2 and, I believe, 3 pieces of evidence, 1 of which was his passport. The second was a menu from the *Batory*, the ship. And the third I don't recall. But there was a third to my knowledge. But I don't recall the detail of it.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you examine the passport?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; I did.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you examine the stamps showing what ports he had entered?

Mr. HARDY. I am not too familiar with that. It was turned over to the FBI and they returned it to us promptly before we gave our answer to Mr. Sage about his attempt to return to work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sage then returned to work at your plant?

Mr. HARDY. Not at that time. Sometime in August of 1952 he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he file at that time the second application for employment which we have identified as Hardy Exhibit No. 2?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. What address did he give in his second application?

Mr. HARDY. 3647A North Market, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is a different address from the one given in the previous application?

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hardy Exhibit No. 1, the first application, and also Hardy Exhibit No. 2, the second application, show the educational training the applicant has had; do they not?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; they have to put that on the application.

Mr. TAVENNER. What educational training did the applicant state he had received?

Mr. HARDY. Through the 12th grade, or high school. No other training beyond that.

Mr. TAVENNER. The second application, Hardy Exhibit No. 2, shows that the applicant had been employed at H. & H. Machine Co.,

4228 Easton Avenue, St. Louis, from January 1951 to May 1951; does it not?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; it does.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any inquiry of that firm regarding that employment?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; that was the only firm that we got an answer on two of those that we sent out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the document marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 3"—your employment reference inquiry and the answer to your inquiry concerning James H. Sage?

Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does it show that he was so employed at H. & H.?

Mr. HARDY. That was verified with the firm name, H. & H. Machine & Motor Parts Co., and it is signed by a Viola, or Visla—I can't quite make that out—Oberfeld, O-b-e-r-f-e-l-d. And it is dated October 29, 1952.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. SCHERER. I have one question. Off the record first.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. SCHERER. If this man Sage had indicated on his application that he had graduated from a number of colleges and had received his master's degree from Washington University and that he had been a professor or an instructor in that college, wouldn't it have raised some question in your mind as to why he was applying for a job on the assembly line?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; there would have been a question.

Mr. SCHERER. Wouldn't you then, perhaps, have conducted a more thorough investigation of this man, had you known those facts?

Mr. HARDY. It would depend to some extent on his most recent work experience. If he had not been teaching recently, and had been in some work that was more or less comparable to ours, we wouldn't have questioned that too much. On the other hand, if he had been teaching up to that point and then was going into assembly work; yes; it would have raised a very serious question in our minds.

Mr. SCHERER. But he did give you three references; did he not?

Mr. HARDY. On both applications he has listed other employment, not teaching jobs.

Mr. SCHERER. And you checked all 3 references but only received a reply from 1? Is that right?

Mr. HARDY. No. On Hardy Exhibit No. 2 here he has two besides this previous experience at our plant. We sent reference inquiries out to 2 of those but only got 1 back. For some reason or another we didn't send them out on this first application which is Hardy Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. SCHERER. And the one reply that you did get back shows that his experience with this company which he listed was rather of short duration; was it not?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; it was not quite 4 months.

Mr. SCHERER. How many months?

Mr. HARDY. Four.

Mr. SCHERER. And in what capacity was he employed by that employer?

Mr. HARDY. The inquiry states crate repairer, which, of course, would be almost an unskilled job.

Mr. SCHERER. And with that information that he worked 3 months as a crate repairer, and with the information that he had had a college education of the type that I have mentioned, together with employment as a professor, would those facts not have caused you to make a more careful investigation of this individual?

Mr. HARDY. Well, of course, this other inquiry which was not returned was for a longer period and was subsequent to the one of 4 months' duration. And the two of them together would represent a little over a year of unskilled or semiskilled employment. We probably wouldn't have questioned that too much if we were in need of employees and under stress and strain of hiring.

Mr. MOULDER. But that isn't verified, the second one. There is no verification of that. You said you had no response from the second reference inquiry.

Mr. HARDY. That is right.

Mr. MOULDER. So you do not know whether or not he was so employed.

Mr. HARDY. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. This is off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe that is all I desire to ask the gentleman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Hardy is excused from his subpoena.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p. m. Saturday, June 2, 1956, the executive session of the subcommittee was recessed subject to the call of the Chair, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and Gordon H. Scherer.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO.. AREA—PART 3

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
St. Louis, Mo.
EXECUTIVE SESSION¹

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 9 a. m., pursuant to call, in room 1100, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representative Morgan M. Moulder.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH JOHN SCHOEMEHL—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Schoemehl, I hand you a document bearing date of April 14, 1947, entitled "Organization Department Report to Clubs," signed Ray Koch, organization secretary, which I mark for identification as "Schoemehl Exhibit No. 1."

Will you examine it, please?

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. This report refers to certain decisions having been made by the Communist Party.

Do you know whether the decisions set forth in that report were made?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Well, there was a meeting held at which this was read, and arrangements were made, the appointments were made to carry this out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall at this time the names of the persons who were appointed to fill the various positions indicated in this document?

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. Outside of the ones of Ray Koch and Al Murphy, which are in the document, I don't recall who was assigned to the other duties.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document, and ask that it be marked "Schoemehl Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be marked "Schoemehl Exhibit No. 1" and admitted in evidence (see Part 1, p. 4731.)

Mr. SCHOEMEHL. That is the original document.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Thank you, sir.

(Whereupon, at 9:05 a. m., June 4, 1956, the executive session of the subcommittee was recessed subject to call.)

¹ Executive testimony ordered released by the committee August 24, 1956.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 3

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
St. Louis, Mo.

EXECUTIVE SESSION ¹

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 6:15 p. m., pursuant to call, in room 1100, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and Gordon H. Scherer.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

Mr. MOULDER. Let the record show that the subcommittee, appointed by the chairman of the full committee, consisting of James B. Frazier, Jr.; Gordon H. Scherer; and myself, Morgan M. Moulder as chairman, is in order.

There being Congressman Scherer and myself present, constituting a quorum, the committee will come to order and proceed.

Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn, Mr. Jones?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. JONES. I do.

TESTIMONY OF OBADIAH JONES

Mr. MOULDER. For good reasons the subcommittee has decided unanimously to hear this witness in executive session.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Will you state your name, please?

Mr. JONES. Rev. Obadiah Jones.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Jones, you have the right to have counsel with you if you desire or to confer with counsel at any time during the questioning if you decide you want to confer with counsel. That is a practice of the committee, and it is something that we explain to every witness.

When and where were you born, Reverend Jones?

Mr. JONES. Holly Grove, Ark.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your age?

¹ Executive testimony ordered released by the committee August 24, 1956.

Mr. JONES. Thirty-eight.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a minister of the gospel in St. Louis?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been in the ministry in St. Louis?

Mr. JONES. Eight years.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you were one of the principal witnesses for the Government in the Smith Act trials in St. Louis in 1954, were you not?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time as a result of the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. JONES. From 1947, latter part of 1947, through 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time did you faithfully report to the Federal Bureau of Investigation such knowledge as you obtained regarding the activities of the Communist Party in St. Louis?

Mr. JONES. Yes, I tried.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned any particular function to perform while a member of the Communist Party? That is, were you assigned any task by the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. I was assigned to CRC.

Mr. TAVENNER. Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the head of the Civil Rights Congress as a result of that assignment?

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. JONES. From 1951, I believe it was, to 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Civil Rights Congress, as organized in St. Louis, directed and controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In your activities in the Communist Party did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Edwin L. Richardson?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he active in connection with the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. JONES. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he hold any position in the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. JONES. He was secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. There was an organization established throughout the United States known as the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. Was there such an organization formed in St. Louis?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Communist Party instrumental in the organization of the St. Louis chapter of the Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. JONES. I don't know whether they were or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party assist in the operation of that group of the Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case?

Mr. JONES. May I ask a question?

When you say "assist" do you mean like take part in the activities of the committee?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what general way did that occur?

Mr. JONES. In mass meetings and, well, they had—a couple of times they had raffling off things to raise money.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall any occasions when representatives of the Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case met with representatives of the Civil Rights Congress to map out a plan of action?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us briefly about it.

Mr. JONES. Well, I was one of the persons. And Massingale and—

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Joseph Massingale? Is that his name?

Mr. JONES. William Massingale.

Mr. TAVENNER. William Massingale.

Mr. JONES. Perkins and his wife met at his home to discuss what we could do to raise money through kind of cooperative work with CRC and the Rosenberg committee.

Mr. MOULDER. What was Perkins' full name?

Mr. JONES. Haven Perkins.

Mr. MOULDER. Is that a man's name?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Clara Perkins, the wife of Haven Perkins, present and participating in the meeting also?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you say that meeting occurred?

Mr. JONES. At their home.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the Perkins' home?

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was William Massingale known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were Mr. and Mrs. Perkins known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. I don't know.

Mr. MOULDER. Upon what do you base your answer about William Massingale?

Mr. JONES. Well, I met with him in party meetings, and carried out with him direct party functioning. And at one time I got the party membership list and his name appeared there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of Ella Mae Posey?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she identified with the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. JONES. No, she wasn't. Directly she wasn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know in what Communist activities, if any, she was engaged?

Mr. JONES. To my knowledge, her engagements were with the youth department. And, of course, I had no affiliation—Well, no work with them directly.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the youth department? Do you mean youth group of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of having had access to the list of the Communist Party members in St. Louis, I believe.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not Ella Mae Posey was on that list?

Mr. JONES. She was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. What were the circumstances under which you were given access to the Communist Party membership list?

Mr. JONES. To check out certain names and to secure contributions for the party.

Mr. MOULDER. Who gave the list to you?

Mr. TAVENNER. Who made that list available to you for that purpose?

Mr. JONES. Let's see. I don't recall just now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it an official of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes; it was an official.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you do not recall his name at this time?

Mr. JONES. No. Let's see. Just a minute. I am not clear on that, who gave it to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are clear, however, on the fact that it was given to you by an official of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you having difficulty in remembering whether the functionary who turned this list over to you was a particular individual or one of several individuals?

Mr. JONES. One of several.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know the names of the several individuals, one of which was the one who turned the membership list over to you?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were they?

Mr. JONES. Helen Musiel or Al Murphy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both were functionaries in the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Mr. James Sage and his wife, Dorothy Sage?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they known to you personally to be members of the Communist Party? Or either of them?

Mr. JONES. Their names did appear on the Communist Party list, membership list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Sol Derman?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. His name also appeared on the Communist Party membership list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee in what Communist Party activities he engaged, if any?

Mr. JONES. He was reporter for the party during the trial, and——

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by reporter?

Mr. JONES. Well, he reported on the Daily Worker.

Could I say something off the record?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you define in more detail the activities in which Mr. Sol Derman engaged?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

He was chairman of the Progressive Party, and also reporter for the Daily Worker during the Communist Party trial in St. Louis. And he was a functionary of the party so far as carrying out specific jobs which the party had for him to do, distributing leaflets, collecting contributions for the party, et cetera.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Dr. Sol Londe?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Not to my knowledge.

I should like to make an explanation there also.

He was with the professional group. All of his work was with the professionals. It was generally understood with party members that they was members of the party, but as to clarity of identification, whether or not he was a member, you see, I don't know. I never met with him in any party meetings, or he never took any part in party work where it concerned nonprofessionals.

Mr. COLLINS. But you knew he was a member of a professional group with the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes. That is part of my explanation, you see. I can't——

Mr. COLLINS. But you couldn't positively say?

Mr. JONES. No. That is right.

Mr. COLLINS. Yet this professional group was known to be a group of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Did you know other persons in that same category, in that same group?

Mr. JONES. I didn't know anybody in the group. I only met with him 1 or 2 meetings. He called me quite frequently to make some kind of announcement at the Ministerial Alliance of things that was going on that the professionals were having, and I didn't know the people in the professional group.

Of course, Sage was—whether he was a member of the professional group I don't know, but he was very active in the professional group. I think at one time he was instructor out at Washington University at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you ever meet Douglas MacLeod?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Explain the circumstances under which you met MacLeod.

Mr. JONES. I knew him as an attorney for members of the party, and he attended Communist Party meetings. I have been in Communist Party meetings where he attended, and he took part in Communist Party activities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Were these closed Communist Party meetings that you attended with him?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. MOULDER. How many people would be present at such meetings?

Mr. JONES. Well, numbers would vary. Maybe 15 or 20, and sometimes 5 or 10.

Mr. MOULDER. Where would they be held usually?

Mr. JONES. At different places. Some of them, I remember, were at the headquarters when they had the headquarters, and at the home of Elliott Waxman.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you receive a notice as to where such a meeting was to be held? How would you receive such notice if you did?

Mr. JONES. These was regular meetings of the party.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Regular Communist Party meetings?

Mr. JONES. Where party members would know that this meeting was going to be held.

Mr. MOULDER. There wouldn't be any special notice of any sort?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. MOULDER. They were regularly established meetings?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. And this man MacLeod would always be present at such meetings? That is, regularly?

Mr. JONES. Yes. Frequently he was present at such places.

I would like to say something off the record, if you will permit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. MOULDER. Let's go on the record again.

Could you name other persons attending Communist Party meetings while you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think we have testimony regarding all of the others.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Harold Hall?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party? And, if so, what group of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. The railroad group.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir. His name appeared on the Communist Party membership list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Going back to the name of MacLeod, I believe you stated that he engaged in various Communist Party activities. Will you describe a little more in detail what you mean.

Mr. MOULDER. May I interrupt by asking, were you ever present at a Communist Party meeting when MacLeod was the principal speaker?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir; when he was one of the speakers, principal speakers.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you recall on what subject he spoke? What was the general philosophy of his speech or subject, shall I say?

Mr. JONES. The general philosophy of his subject would be the legality of the Communist Party, I guess. He would always be stating, telling us members of the Communist Party what you could do and what you could not do, what the law could do and what the law could not do about what you did.

And most of the time back in those days we were having quite a bit of trouble with police brutality and the members of the Communist Party being picked up about distributing leaflets, or sound equipment on a machine or something, and then he would come into a meeting and we would have a mass meeting on this affair to see what we was going to do, map out the strategy and which way to go. And he would come in and give the legal advice on telling us what to do, what types of leaflets to get out and what the law could not do.

Even though we would be arrested and carried down, the law states and the statute of the law says this and it says that, and they can't do this or they can't do that.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know whether or not he was paid any compensation? Or was he voluntarily giving his services as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. That I don't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that covers everything.

Mr. JONES. Well, a couple of times there he was fighting a case on police brutality where he was paid, they said, for transcripts and stuff like that. But he was paid some money.

Mr. MOULDER. Reference was made a while ago to Ella Mae Posey.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. You say you were personally acquainted with her?

Mr. JONES. I knew her. Not too personally.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you ever present at Communist Party meetings when she was present?

Mr. JONES. Would you state that question again.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you ever present at Communist Party meetings when she was present?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. And do you recall where the meetings were held?

Mr. JONES. At the Communist Party headquarters. That was—

Mr. MOULDER. On Grand Avenue?

Mr. JONES. On Grand Avenue. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. 1041?

Mr. JONES. 1041. That is right.

And, of course, she carries two names, too.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know the reason for that?

Mr. JONES. No.

Mr. MOULDER. What were the names?

Mr. JONES. For a while she was called Ella Mae Posey and Ella Mae Pappademos.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what way did the Communist Party endeavor to exploit the members of your race?

Mr. JONES. Well, they used various tactics. First of all, they would go into the very lowest neighborhood, the most slummed areas in the city, and they might pick out a house where it is an old roominghouse that should be torn down, it is true, where a lot of bums would be staying that didn't work. They wouldn't work if they had a job.

And, of course, they would go in and start talking to them and show them where they were living and how they were living and why they had to live under such conditions—because of the capitalistic—that this was the manner in which the capitalistic society operated.

And they would then offer to them the manner in which the Communist Party operated.

They also would obviously bring out the point of the depression because everybody remembered the depression, and they would point up the fact that in Russia there never had been a depression, and that they were persons who were interested in the Negro race because they were the downtrodden and the offcasts and nobody wanted them or cared anything for them, nobody wanted to help them. And they were those who were interested in helping them to live better in better homes and get better jobs and survive better by their way of living.

That way they were able to just bring in mass numbers of Negro people into the organization at various meetings whereas maybe they never did see them no more at another meeting.

Of course, they knew how to do that. They would go out and have a mass dance and have an interracial dance. They would buy drinks and beer and whisky and wine and stuff and give the people to drink. And you would have an interracial dance, and they would sit back and say, "Now this is the way we operate. You can't operate like this no other place. You can't go to the Jefferson Hotel. You can't go downtown to this place and that place and Negro men and white women dance together and colored women and white men dance together and act like human beings, marry if they want to, as far as that matter. And this is the way of life."

Of course, there are in every race, I guess, those people who are easily led. They just don't think about anything. And certainly it is true in our race. The person is looking for something for nothing. And he says well, everybody wants to be helped regardless of what his condition might be. And then he would fill out an application and maybe he would come back and maybe he don't. Nine times out of ten he would never come back again, but he would be the means of a dollar for an application blank, or he would at least be the means for maybe a couple or so dollars later on because when they took the application blank, whether he came back or not, they did not forget him. They would cut that list down and divide it up into various groups of regular party functioning members, and they would go out into the neighborhoods.

I have done it a lot of times, and knocking on doors and saying to this fellow, "Well, it is now time for you to renew your membership" or "We have a drive going on and we are trying to raise so much money for this" and collect money and take the money.

That was the way in which the big shots, the big wigs up at the top survived. They got money in that way.

Those are the most prominent ways in which they exploit Negroes and get them into the Communist Party.

And, of course, they used the school system for one of the major ways. They use segregation in the department stores downtown. They would come down with placards and they would picket some of these places out here where they had a fountain where colored was not permitted to be served, and they would go out and tell the Negroes, "You see, we are for you because nobody else would have done this. We can go down and eat there. We want you to be able to go down and eat. So we go down and you can go with us and see us there. And you know that when we do this we are trying to help you."

Naturally, persons would be deceived by the manner in which they would go about that.

Mr. COLLINS. When they learned about this deception did they finally resent this action on the part of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Well, yes. There was a resentment on the part of the persons, some of the Negroes. But I remind you that most of these people, most of the intelligent persons, they resented it from the very beginning. But they didn't go to them. They didn't go to the professionals or to the decent persons. They went down on Biddle Street, to persons that were not able to read or write, and they bewildered them. And, of course, they themselves, after a while, would resent the action of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. You realized pretty early that the Communists were only pretending to champion Negro civil rights for the purpose of getting them to come in the party, didn't you?

Mr. JONES. Oh, sure, yes, absolutely.

Mr. SCHERER. You knew that they weren't sincerely interested in their civil rights.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes.

I had several very difficult struggles and fights with them on the basis of what they said they stood for when they really didn't stand for it. I mean kind of in the back there you could tell he didn't stand for what he said he would stand for. And we had several fights about it at various meetings.

I knew from the very outset that they didn't stand for what they said they stand for. They would denounce Christians under any faith or any belief. They don't believe in that. They believe in Stalin and Lenin and Engels. That is the principle for which they preach. However, they don't carry out the part of the science of Lenin that I read. They don't carry that out either.

Mr. MOULDER. They do not practice what they preach?

Mr. JONES. Not at all.

Mr. SCHERER. Negroes are generally religious people?

Mr. JONES. Sure.

Their main purpose was, however, so they could get enough people in number. They knew that some of the number would fall off. But if he brings in, say, a hundred persons, and out of that hundred he might be able to convince 50, may we say, well, his number was growing stronger. And that was his main purpose, to get his number strong enough, and with the force that they have in Russia, and the connections that they have, when they had enough people here to say, well, I've got enough in St. Louis to do what I want to do here.

And then he makes some connections somewhere with Russia and then he will do what he wants to do. That is all the only purpose for it.

Mr. SCHERER. They did that same thing with the Jewish people, pretended to champion the cause of anti-Semitism.

Mr. JONES. Well, in 1948 here in St. Louis they had everything set up. It was all ready for the revolution. It was going to be in 1948. There was a public speech about it. I became quite excited about that because they preached it so strongly, and they were all so convinced and they knew so much about what they was talking about. I became a little bit afraid. I said, "Well, I guess I will go down in Arkansas somewhere to get out of the revolution." I certainly didn't want to be in it.

That was when they were advising everybody to get guns and ammunition and be ready for whatever took place.

They made a statement——

Mr. COLLINS. Who advised you to do this?

Mr. JONES. This was Ralph Shaw. And right after—this was just before he left. And then right after him came Jim Forrest.

Mr. SCHERER. Were both of those men white?

Mr. JONES. Yes; they were leaders of the Communist Party. They were organizers.

Mr. MOULDER. They were actually trying to stir up a race riot and then point at that as an example of how colored people were being abused. In other words, they instigated it to cause trouble, and then later on they would point it out as an example.

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Mr. MOULDER. In other sections of the country.

Mr. SCHERER. Of the dissatisfaction.

Mr. COLLINS. Did they ever mention Detroit or Chicago as examples of this?

Mr. JONES. Well, there was a couple of incidents that they did refer to in Chicago. There was one time in Chicago they had a project there that was supposed to be built for Negroes, as I understand it.

Mr. COLLINS. Down in South Chicago.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

And when they were completed, seemingly, white people moved in. Well, the Communist Party got enough members of the party together and they went in and moved out some of the white people. And they would move out a white family here and move in a colored family. And some way or another they did that business there to kind of forcefully get the party members, mostly Negroes, into this project.

I was there one time, and they had a big parade and picket line, and they barricaded this whole area there because some nonparty members were attempting to fight back by running automobiles through the streets, through this place. And they took the beds and mattresses and chairs and things out and barricaded the streets and had a big parade and went down to the mayor of the city to get official barricades put up. They refused to do that.

Mr. SCHERER. What year did this conversation about revolution and rioting take place?

Mr. JONES. That was in 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask one further question?

In what way did the Communist Party utilize the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. JONES. For the purpose of educating people and making them ready for membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. I have no questions.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Hershel Walker?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what Communist Party activities did he engage?

Mr. JONES. All of them. I met with him in closed party meetings.

Mr. MOULDER. The subcommittee will stand in recess. Before standing in recess, we want to thank you, Reverend Jones, for appearing before us and giving us the benefit of the information you have by your testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. I think he has made a valuable contribution, and the record should show that we congratulate him and express the thanks of the Congress and this committee for his fine testimony.

(Whereupon, at 7:30 p. m., Monday, June 4, 1956, the executive session of the subcommittee was recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

A barcode sticker from the Boston Public Library, featuring a series of vertical black bars of varying widths on a white background. The text "BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY" is visible at the top of the sticker.

10

23 24 25

22

454

pts 1-2

Imports p/s - 4

Page 10

7. Lewis, p. 4

4. Dr. S.

